



The American Revolution at the Bicentennial: A Survey of Issues and Recent Historical Monographs

Author(s): Eldon P. Turner

Source: *Revista de Historia de América*, No. 82 (Jul. - Dec., 1976), pp. 159-193

Published by: Pan American Institute of Geography and History

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20139245>

Accessed: 06/02/2010 12:22

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=paigh>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Pan American Institute of Geography and History is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Revista de Historia de América*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AT THE BICENTENNIAL: A SURVEY OF ISSUES AND RECENT HISTORICAL MONOGRAPHS

This paper is not definitive. It merely surveys part of the recent literature and discusses several trends in the historiography of the American Revolution. As is true of any such effort it rests on the work of others which is itself part of the historiography.¹ Most important among many are Edmund Morgan's "The American Re-

¹ Edmund Morgan, "American Revolution: Revisions in Need of Revising," *William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd S., XIV (January, 1957), 3-15. Edmund Morgan, ed., *The American Revolution: Two Centuries of Interpretation* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), which covers the immediate post-Revolution period, a period I have not covered in this paper. Jack P. Greene, ed., *The Reinterpretation of the American Revolution, 1763-1789* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968). Marian J. Morton, *The Terrors of Ideological Politics: Liberal Historians in a Conservative Mood* (Cleveland, Ohio: The Press of Case Western Reserve University, 1972). Also useful: Alden T. Vaughan and George Athan Billias, ed., *Perspectives on Early American History: Essays in Honor of Richard B. Morris* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), Stephen G. Kurtz and James H. Hutson, *Essays on the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1973), Richard B. Morris, *The American Revolution Reconsidered* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967), Merrill Jensen, *The American Revolution within America*, the Anson G. Phelps Lectureship Series in Early American History (New York: New York University Press, 1974), and Louis B. Wright, *New Interpretations of American Colonial History*, publication No. 16 (2nd ed.: Washington, D. C.: Service Center for Teachers, 1963). A book not available to me as yet, Alfred E. Young, ed., *The American Revolution: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism* (DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 1974). *The Development of a Revolutionary Mentality*, Library of Congress Symposia on the American Revolution, Papers from First Symposium, May 5 and 6, 1972 (Washington, D. C., Library of Congress, 1972), has also been useful. Richard Middleton, "British Historians and the American Revolution," *American Studies*, 16 (Spring, 1975), 43-58; John B. Kirby, "Early American Politics—The Search for Ideology: An Historiographical Analysis and Critique of the Concept of 'Deference,'" *Journal of Politics*, 32 (November, 1970), 808-838; Robert E. Stalhope, "Towards a Republican Synthesis: The Emergence of an Understanding of Republicanism in American Historiography," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd S., XXIX (January, 1972), 49-80; Gordon S. Wood, "Rhetoric and Reality in the American Revolution," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd S., XXIII (January, 1966), 3-32 have all been helpful. Especially interesting is Cecelia M. Kenyon, "Republicanism and Radicalism in the American Revolution: An Old-Fashioned Interpretation," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd S., XIX (April, 1962), 153-182. Don Higginbotham, "American Historians and the Military History of the American Revolution," *American Historical Review*, LXX (October, 1964), 18-34, will be of interest to military historians and social historian alike. Of course, other works, too numerous to mention have contributed to our understanding of the American Revolution. I am particularly indebted to a group of fine scholars whose book reviews in the *William and Mary Quarterly* and elsewhere allow all of us to use a limited amount of time most effectively.

volution; Revisions in Need of Rivising," which appeared in 1957, his edited *The American Revolution: Two Centuries of Interpretation* (1965), and Jack P. Green's edited work *The Reinterpretation of the American Revolution, 1763-1789*, which includes "The Reappraisal of the American Revolution in Recent Historical Literature," the most important historiographical essay to appear through 1968. A fourth work has had none of the scholarly acclaim that these more established works have and deserve, but it is praiseworthy and important: Marian J. Morton's *The Terrors of Ideological Politics: Liberal Historians in a Conservative Mood* (1972): Morton's work concentrates on a few historians, but she outlines one side of an important historiographical controversy.

American revolutionary history has traditionally been divided into several schools: the Whig school which has seen the revolutionary era from the perspective of libertarian developments; the imperial school which has seen the era from the perspective of empire; the Progressive school which has seen the era as a period of conflict between classes; the neo-Whig or consensus school which has seen the era as a period of basic agreement among those who participated in and accepted the Revolution. Part I of this study discusses each of these schools briefly, its development and its past literature. Part II takes up the issue between those who see class conflict in the era and those who see consensus. This issue has been primary in the historiography and has developed what is now being called the "deference" school of U. S. politics. Part III discusses topically a number of works which have appeared over the past five or six years and which cannot be characterized historiographically. As will emerge in this paper, this author accepts the idea that, in a very general sense, historical interpretation follows the national "mood."

I: *Historiographical Schools*

In the late nineteenth century, after about eighty years of patriotic history, a group of young historians began to ask whether the American Revolution had been such a happy event after all. Without the context of the empire the British colonies of North America were fairly unimportant areas of European settlement, and the mother country was clearly the hub of economic activity for all colonies. At a time when European colonialism was at its height, this interpretation of United States history was well received. Lawrence Harvey Gipson's fifteen volume study of the British Empire between 1748 and 1776 is the most important work of this school, and during the past few years his final two volumes have appeared, *The British Empire Before the American Revolution*, Vol. XIV: *A Bibliographical Guide to the History of the British Empire, 1748-1776*; Vol. XV: *A Guide to Manuscripts Relating to the History of the British Empire, 1748-1776*; (1969, 1970).

Gipson's view that the American Revolution was merely part of the Great War for Empire has been shared by such historians as Herbert Osgood, "The American Revolution," (1898) and George Louis Beer, *British Colonial Policy, 1754-1765* (1907),

and Charles McLean Andrews, *Colonial Background of the American Revolution: Four Essays In American Colonial History* (1924).² The work of these scholars spans more than three quarters of a century, and rests on the conviction that the empire, whatever its faults, was fairly well administered from London. A most concise example of the imperial schools is Oliver M. Dickerson's *The Navigation Acts and the American Revolution* (1951), which finds the acts both acceptable and profitable to the empire and to the British colonials in North America, Ralph Davis, *The Rise of the Atlantic Economics* (1973) has lent support to one of the imperial school's assertions: the main economic influence of the colonial world in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was within the European economies.

Although the imperial school has long been an accepted part of American colonial historiography, it has had its critics. In 1956 Edmund Morgan called for the application of local study to colonial politics and for an extension of Sir Lewis Namier's methods to the empire and the Revolution in the colonies. Namier, of course, was critical of the empire; his detailed examination of Whig politics in England led to the conclusion that politics there during the eighteenth century was corrupted by petty selfinterest and local intrigue.³

In the recent literature there are several books which meet the imperial conception. Michael Kammen, *Empire and Interest: The American Colonies and the Politics of Mercantilism*, is the most important. Kammen's extended essay explores the development of interest groups in English politics and in imperial administration, and finds the answer to the imperial historians in a pamphlet from 1757, "a *Chain of Self-Interest* is indeed no better than a *Rope of Sand*: There is no Cement nor *Cohesion* between the Parts: There is rather a mutual *Antipathy* and *Repulsion*." Kammen's wide-ranging work takes up issues of economic and political philosophy, administrative history, political legitimacy and the nature of eighteenth-century imperial culture (a word which

² Lawrence Harvey Gipson, *The British Empire Before the American Revolution*, 15 vols. (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1954-1970); Herbert Levi Osgood, "The American Revolution," *Political Science Quarterly*, XIII (March, 1898), 41-49; Charles McLean Andrews, *Colonial Background of the American Revolution: Four Essays in American Colonial History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1924); George Louis Beer, *British Colonial Policy, 1754-1765* (New York: P. Smith, 1933/1907); Leonard Woods Labaree, *Royal Government in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930) for a favorable treatment. More recently: Oliver M. Dickerson, *The Navigation Acts and the American Revolution* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, Co., 1951), but see as well Lawrence A. Harper, "The Effects of the Navigation Acts on the Thirteen Colonies," in Richard B. Morris, ed., *The Era of the American Revolution: Studies Inscribed to Everts Boutell Greene* (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1939), 1-39, and Curtis P. Nettels, "British Mercantilism and the Economic Development of the Thirteen Colonies," *Journal of Economic History*, XII (Spring, 1952), 195-114, for disagreement. Robert Paul Thomas, "A Quantitative Approach to the Study of the Effects of British Imperial Policy upon Colonial Welfare: Some Preliminary Findings," *Journal of Economic History*, XXV (December, 1965), 615-639, which agrees with Dickerson. The imperial concept is not dead. See also, G. M. Walton, "New Economic History and the Burden of the Navigation Acts," *Economic History Review*, 2nd S., 24 (November, 1971), 533-542, and a discussion, 25 (November, 1973), 668-671.

³ Morgan, "Revisions," 5-6. Sir Lewis Namier *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III*, 2 vols. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1929), and *England in the Age of the American Revolution* (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1930). Also interesting is Charles R. Ritcheson, *British Politics and the American Revolution* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954), and Eric Robson, *The American Revolution in its Political and Military Aspects, 1763-1783* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1965/1955), an excellent interpretative work.

here means much the same as the political sociologist's use of the term political culture.) He finds that a mutual antipathy gradually developed between the imperial administration and colonial interests, particularly when an "excess of interests" came to dominate Parliament. Hence, the American Revolution.⁴

No other work of the last five years is as comprehensive in its criticism of the imperial conceptualization as Kammen's, but two specific studies have expanded our understanding of the empire. P.D.G. Thomas, *British Politics and the Stamp Act Crisis: The First Phase of the American Revolution, 1763-1767* (1975), treats the British phase of this important first crisis in the empire. Thomas provides scholars with a fairly complete examination of British politics as it related to the stamp tax, and, using new information, takes exception to the important contribution of Helen and Edmund Morgan, *The Stamp Act Crisis* (1953), that George Grenville gave the colonials a year of grace in which to find another method of taxation. Thomas proves that Grenville simply changed his mind and decided to apply the tax after all. Charles H. Ritcheson whose *British Politics and the American Revolution* (1954) was a pioneering effort in the application of Namierist methods to the American Revolution, has provided scholars with another work, *Aftermath of Revolution: British Policy Toward the United States, 1783-1795* (1969). Ritcheson examines Loyalists, pre-war indebtedness, the problems of the Old Northwest and Indian policy. In commerce and trade he finds the logical area of accommodation as well as competition between the nations. His use of sources is excellent, and even though he provides little that is new, his study does provide a different point of view about the empire and the U.S. after the Revolution. Further insight into the administration of the empire comes from Neil R. Stout, *The Royal Navy in America, 1760-1775: A Study of Enforcement of British Colonial Policy in the Era of the American Revolution* (1973). This work is to the royal navy what John Shy's book, *Toward Lexington: The Role of the British Army in the Coming of the American Revolution* and what Carl Ubbelohde's *The Vice-Admiralty Courts and the American Revolution* (1965) are to these administrative units of the empire.

⁴ Michael Kammen, *Empire and Interest: The American Colonies and the Politics of Mercantilism* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, Co., 1970); P. D. G. Thomas, *British Politics and the Stamp Act Crisis: The First Phase of the American Revolution, 1763-1767* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975); Helen and Edmund Morgan, *The Stamp Act Crisis: Prologue to Revolution* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1953); Charles H. Ritcheson, a second book from the British perspective, and *Aftermath of Revolution: British Policy Toward the United States, 1783-1795* (Dallas, Texas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1969); Neil R. Stout, *The Royal Navy in America, 1765-1775: A Study of Enforcement of British Colonial Policy in the Era of the American Revolution* (Annapolis, Maryland: Naval Institute Press, 1973); John Shy, *Toward Lexington: The Role of the British Army in the coming of the American Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960) and Carl Ubbelohde, *The Vice-Admiralty Courts and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1965). Also interesting in that they raise objections to the imperial perspective: Joseph Albert Ernst, *Money and Politics in America, 1755-1775: A Study in the Currency Act of 1764 and the Political Economy of Revolution* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1974), and James F. Sheperd and Gary M. Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade and the Economic Development of Colonial North America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972). This last study raises the question of capital importation to the colonies for the period 1768-1772, and finds a deficit. They stick to economic analysis and have compiled an impressive array of information which will be useful to other scholars.

Stout's book explains both practice and rationale for the use of arms to enforce imperial regulations.

This author intends no double meaning when he says that the imperial interpretation will not die of Michael Kammen's dose. Corruption and interest, a coincidence of private claims with public expenditures, do not, *ipso facto*, prove that the empire was not well run and that the citizens of the British colonies were "justified" in their revolution. Yet, current scholarship suggests that those who wish to support the imperial view of the imperial view of the American Revolution have some very pointed questions to answer.

Among historians of the nineteenth century the Whig interpretation dominated the story of the American Revolution.⁵ These historians viewed the struggle for American independence from an almost Burkean perspective. George Bancroft, a product of the intense nationalism of the early Republic, published his ten volume *History of the United States* (1834-1874), and in it portrayed United States history as a struggle of liberty against an asserted tyranny colonial freedom against English tyranny. The liberty he depicted was the natural bent of human kind, and the United States was the place where it succeeded most admirably. Hence, for the Whig historian, liberty was an amorphous psychological drive which dominated the actions of mankind. Democracy resulted when liberty triumphed. Ideals were paramount. Patriotism and nationalism were methods through which the drive for freedom could be expressed. These same ideals were shared by English historian George Otto Trevelyan whose *The American Revolution* (1899-1913) largely reflects Bancroft's intense description of the struggle for freedom.

In the late nineteenth century young scholars trained in new scholarly methods challenged this filiopietistic view of United States history. Some of these scholars took an imperial view while others struck out on a strongly materialist perception of history in general and of United States history in particular. These historians, reflecting the Progressive Era in American politics, created a story which emphasized conflict between the lower classes, whose interest lay with greater democratization, and the upper classes whose interests lay with greater control. Property was the controlling factor. Early works by Charles H. Lincoln and Carl Becker⁶ paved the way for Charles Beard's *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* (1913), a study that has largely dominated

⁵ George Bancroft, *History of the United States* 10 vols., (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1834-1874). John Fiske, *The Critical Period* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1888), assessed the Confederation period negatively and made the Constitution the actual turning point for the establishment of democracy and liberty. Whig historians believed that Divine Providence also played an important role, having special plans for the United States, a mission to bring freedom to other peoples.

⁶ Charles H. Lincoln, *The Revolutionary Movement in Pennsylvania, 1760-1776* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1901), and Carl L. Becker, *History of Political Parties in the Province of New York, 1760-1776* (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1909). These early works also indicate a trend which Progressive historians will follow: local political history. The importance of local history has been recognized since the late 1950's, but it was in eclipse between World War II and about 1957. See Morgan, "Revisions." Other important Progressive works include, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., *The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1918), J. Franklin Jameson, *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1926), Allan

scholarly controversy about the American Revolution. Progressive historians viewed as window-dressing the expressed revolutionary ideals, freedom and democracy. These were rationalizations that were necessary to fit the explanation of the Revolution to upper-class expedience. Progressive perceptions gradually came to dominate professional historical scholarship, and in the 1930's, when the Great Depression gave economic explanations a particularly compelling appeal, these interpretations came to hold sway among most academicians. Progressive concepts have never been totally eclipsed, but they were superseded by another view of U.S. history.

World War II and the subsequent cold war made nationalism and patriotism once again legitimate concerns. Moreover, a period of intense popular ideological activity among a vocal group in the U.S. Senate led American historians to what seems an accommodation with two forces: the legitimacy of nationalist ideals and a fear of ideology, a fear which derived from the western experience with both Hitler's National Socialism and the Marxist Revolution in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.⁷ Shortly after the war, scholars began to handle the apparent contradictions through an eclectic approach to United States history.

This approach to history allowed for the most complex view of mankind yet presented in U.S. history, a view which saw individuals now pursuing interests, now ideals, now power and fame, all according to their immediate circumstances. These scholars distrusted ideology whether it came from the materialist left or the idealist right. They held to a middle way and claimed that they represented no ideology. Rational explanations might be true or false in the philosophical sense. Events in history might be calculated or accidental. Over time history was not designed by individuals but could represent human nature, whatever that was. Yet, historical progress had been produced by adherence to a set of ideals—the Enlightenment and romantic concepts of empiricism, individualism, science and the insistence that the single human being had to be the historical unit of greatest regard. In the best western tradition, then, these scholars presented the particular over the general.

From this general orientation stemmed a point of view which U.S. history as the history of individualism, basic agreement on fundamental values, and saw a uniqueness which gave the United States an attachment to economic and social mobility, free discussion, progress, and amelioration rather than revolution as a means of solving social

Nevins, *The American States During and After the Revolution* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1924), and Carl L. Becker, *The Declaration of Independence* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1922). Of course, Charles Beard, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States of America* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1913), was the most important work. Most readers will be familiar with Beard's thesis: those who held personality or property in public paper or other "financial" property were the successful proponents of a strong central government. Those who held real property in land or slaves were less interested and ultimately formed the nucleus of the Antifederalist Party, later the Jeffersonian Republicans. Several antagonisms are evident: North-South, Agrarian-Capital, East-West. Beard also saw ratification as a repudiation of revolutionary principles and believed that the Constitution had only been ratified because some voters were apathetic and others were too poor to fit the franchise requirements. These and other implications have formed the basis for the dominant historiographical quarrel among students of U. S. history, a quarrel which I cover in more detail in Part II.

⁷ The best explanation is in Morton, *Liberal Historians*, where these ideas form the major thesis.

problems. They wrote national history rather than the history of classes or the history of empires. They have been called neo-Whig for obvious reasons, and have been labeled conservative or supporters of United States parochialism. Most properly, they have been called scholars of American consensus. In their work they have emphasized similarities rather than differences. Consensus characterized the people of British North America, consensus about liberty and what it meant, consensus about the mercantile system and consensus about politics.⁸

On the whole these scholars trusted "rational" political values, but distrusted the "irrational" concepts of ideologies. They looked for similarities, and found them in culture as well as politics. Hence, Clinton Rossiter's *Seedtime of the Republic* (1953) and Max Savelle's *Seeds of Liberty: The Genesis of the American Mind* (1948) said that the inhabitants of the colonies established a general and widely held political theory as well as a general culture. Robert E. Brown's study of voting patterns, *Middle Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1690-1780* (1955), established that property was widely held among white males in Massachusetts and that voting was widespread among this class of persons. His conclusion was that a middle-class democracy existed in Massachusetts during the eighteenth century. Brown and his scholarly partner, B. Katherine Brown, did a subsequent study, *Virginia 1705-1786: Democracy or Aristocracy* which turned up much the same evidence.

These and other works in a similar vein aroused some controversy. One prominent intellectual historian, John Higham, published a complaint against the trust of consensus history, "The Cult of the 'American Consensus': Homogenizing Our History." When the Browns published their study of Virginia, the consensus school was already declining. Greater sophistication in political analysis, the knowledge that voting tells as relatively little about a political culture, and the knowledge that fairly rigid class lines can persist in a culture even though there is rather great mobility, led scholars in the direction of more detailed local studies.⁹ Moreover, the rights of minorities came into the national consciousness with the election of John F. Kennedy, and the "American Consensus" could hardly survive the acknowledgement that the majority was historically guilty of neglecting minority rights. Ultimately, the Viet Nam War led students and scholars in

⁸ Most often cited are Clinton Rossiter, *Seedtime of the Republic: The Origin of the American Tradition of Political Liberty* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1953), Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought Since the Revolution* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1955), Robert E. Brown, *Middle-Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1691-1780* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1955), Edmund and Helen M. Morgan, *The Stamp Act Crisis: Prologue to Revolution* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1953), Daniel Boorstin, *The Americans: The Colonial Experience* (New York: Random House, 1958), Broadus Mitchell, *Alexander Hamilton, Youth to Maturity, 1755-1788* (New York: Macmillan and Co., Inc., 1957), and Cecelia Kenyon, "Men of Little Faith: The Anti-Federalists on the Nature of Representative Government," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd S., XII (Jan., 1955), 4-43. Mitchell's biography should be considered in light of his more recent *Alexander Hamilton: The Revolutionary Years* (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1970), which, along with several other biographies mentioned below, carries forward this more positive "consensus" revision of the original anti-democratic assessment of Hamilton.

⁹ John Higham, "The Cult of the 'American Consensus': Homogenizing our History," *Commentary*, XXVII (February, 1959), 93-100. Robert E. and B. Katherine Brown, *Virginia 1705-1786: Democracy or Aristocracy?* (East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University Press, 1964). After the mid-1960's the volume of consensus history began to decline.

the United States away from national ideals toward the left, toward anarchy, or toward a strong localist orientation. In the ideological atmosphere of the mid—and late—sixties, consensus history faced a diminishing audience.

During the period of decline, Bernard Bailyn published his three works, *Pamphlets of the American Revolution* (1965), *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (1967) and *The Origins of American Politics* (1968).¹⁰ In part, the strength of this interpretative exposition rests on its powerful internal argument. But in part, its strength rests on a turn from anti-ideological, pragmatic appreciation of the American system toward an admission that ideas and ideologies are and have been important. Bailyn accentuates this importance. He examines in detail the general perceptions about liberty, rights, humanity and government which the colonials brought to their constitutional and political debates. Colonials, he finds, suspected that certain elements in England were conspiring to destroy English liberty. Moreover, the colonials so feared these suspected plans that they developed an offensive perception of freedom which allowed them to fight "slavery, corruption, conspiracy", at first with their counter-balanced constitutional ideas, ultimately with arms. Hence, the American Revolution was an intellectual and psychological upheaval. In this context one must consider Edmund Morgan's acknowledgement about property: property, Morgan says, was an aspect of revolutionary ideology. The attachment to property may itself be tied to a perception of liberty.¹¹ The intellectual and psychological revolution among the American colonials thus rested on property, the rights of Englishmen and politics, all of these "value" in a pragmatic sense. These ideological issues rendered the colonies independent.¹² It is important to recognize that Bailyn's work is much more than an exercise in the history of ideas. Its intellectual rigor, Bailyn's reputation and the shift towards ideology in American academic circles have made it the dominant work between 1965 and 1975. Bailyn's work has broken new ground and has allowed consensus history to break out of its narrow, fearful approach to ideology. Other historians have taken a similar view, and from their work, as well as Bailyn's, a complex conception of politics and ideas has emerged. This conception, which emphasizes deference among the people of colonial America, is a synthesis of

¹⁰ Bernard Bailyn, *Pamphlets of the American Revolution*, Vol. I and *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1965, 1967), and *The Origins of American Politics* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968). Complaints against the "tone" of Bailyn's work are evident from Gary B. Nash's review of another essay by Bailyn in Stephen G. Kurtz and James H. Hutson, *Essays on the American Revolution* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1973), in which Nash states that in Bailyn's essay, "evidence of social tensions and social change in the pre-Revolutionary decades is offhandedly dismissed or denied, the receptivity to ideology at different levels of society and in different geographical and socioeconomic areas is assumed to be uniform," and that Bailyn's assertion that his interpretation is "mature" masks his consensus partisanship. Nash, review in *William and Mary Quarterly*, XXXI (April, 1974), 313.

¹¹ Morgan, "Revisions," 11.

¹² In this context one should consider Paul K. Conkin, *Self-Evident Truths: Being a Discourse on the 'Origins' and 'Development' of the First Principles of American Government—Popular Sovereignty, Natural Rights, and 'Balance' and 'Separation of Powers'* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1974), a "biography" of sovereignty in which Conkin, who is no consensus scholar, speaks of the dangers which we face from the recent political splintering. He suggests that the one philosophical tradition which is common to all in U. S. culture is the teleology of first principles: the political heritage of the American Revolution.

Progressive and consensus history, but some authors see in it simply a restatement of the consensus position, a restatement, overlaid with a patina of "objectivity."¹³

Despite the inhospitable academic and national climate, consensus history continues to appear. Robert E. Brown and Rowland Berthoff have produced such work, and Richard B. Morris, who would be dismayed to find his name in this category, has produced a very interesting analysis of revolutionary ideals in the practical world. Brown, whose studies on Massachusetts and Virginia have already been noted, has a history of challenging the materialist ideology of the Progressive school. His *Charles Beard and the Constitution, A Critical Analysis of An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* appeared in 1956 and is second in professional respect only to Forrest McDonald's *We The People: Economic Origin of the Constitution* (1958). In his new work Brown reassesses Carl Becker's *History of Political Parties in the Province of New York, 1760-1776* (1909). To be specific, Brown's *Carl Becker on History and the American Revolution* finds error in Becker's count of freemen. The conclusions are not surprising. More voting mean a democratic people, and the high party tensions which Becker found between the wealthy and the poor probably did not exist. Brown's study reflects neither the increased sophistication of political culture nor the reality of political history which students of the period have gleaned from recent studies.¹⁴

Richard B. Morris in an interesting work titled *The Emerging Nations and the American Revolution* (1970) brings together the libertarian ideal of the first colonial revolution and the experience of the African and Asian nations which are now emerging from colonial dominance.¹⁵ American radicals pursued a set of ideals which they derived

¹³ Jesse Lemisch in a review of Bailyn, *Ideological Origins, New Republic*, 159 (May 25, 1968), accuses Bailyn of allowing upper class statements to stand for the culture as a whole. Bailyn finds among the population a widescale harmony which Lemisch does not accept. Fundamentally, Lemisch asks for reassessment of historical methodology, what is acceptable as evidence. He wants actions to be evidence for ideas beyond the ascertainable or stated ideas which presumably accompany the actions. His assumption is that until other scholars accept such a methodology, they will continue to limit our historical understanding. Such a limit is no more objective, even though it fits the accepted canons of scholarship, than a more imaginative recreation of events and ideas. For further insight see an exchange of letters, cited above, between Bailyn and Gary B. Nash in which Nash suggests that Bailyn's claims to value-free history are false by the nature of the investigation. I believe that Nash is correct.

¹⁴ Robert E. Brown, *Carl Becker on History and the American Revolution* (East Lansing, Michigan: The Spartan Press, 1970). My reference here is to the systems scholars who have dominated political science since the early 1960's, most notably Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1965), but I refer as well to the important work by such historians as J. R. Pole, Richard Buel and Gordon S. Wood as cited below.

¹⁵ Richard B. Morris, *The Emerging Nations and the American Revolution* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970). Morris is usually not regarded as a consensus historian. Indeed, his "Class Struggle and the American Revolution," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd S., XIX (April, 1962), 3-29, was an early statement which questioned the formulations of the consensus school. Yet, here he writes against the Viet Nam War and seeks to use the values which traditionally accompany the American Revolution to 'homogenize' not only U. S. history but also the anti-American socialism of Third World revolutionaries. Political extremism, of course, changes the circumstances of scholarship, and I almost feel as though I should apologize to Professor Morris. In light of the bicentennial year I think several considerations are important: the U. S. is now under "attack" from the Third World; academia is now emerging from a period of splintering, a period which saw myriad concepts of education acceptable; a conservative reaction accompanies our emergence from the late 1960's and early 1970's. Neither Morris's work nor Conkin's

from the European Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. Radicals who lead the emerging nations pursue similar social and political ideals which are the revolutionary ideology of the mid-twentieth century. His is a happy comparison, but Morris fails to account for either the diversity which characterized the British colonials from Maine to Georgia or the diversity which characterize the many national revolutions of the post World War II years.

A work of more general historical interest is Rowland Berthoff's *An Unsettled People: Social Order and Disorder in American History* (1971). Berthoff traces the development of society from the New England communities, through the unsettling social and geographical mobility which have continued to characterize American society, and into the radical changes of the 1960's. He conceived his book in the early 1960's when the consensus school was strong. As he says in his introduction, he deliberately set out to write a general work on U.S. social history, a work which would fit the national or consensus pattern as exemplified in Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought since the Revolution* (1955); Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Genius of American Politics* (1953); David M. Potter, *People of Plenty: Economic Abundance and the American Character* (1954); Berthoff is a self-described conservative whose major thesis, confirmed from his point of view when the consensus school declined, is that diversity in the United States has often destroyed cohesiveness. For example, concern with economic values replaced social concerns at the time of the American Revolution, and the economic values dominated American society throughout the nineteenth century. Periodic crises in American society can largely be traced to the lack of an "adequately functioning set of relationships among the organized institutions of a well-founded social structure." Above all, he regards dependence on atomizing values as inimical to the structure and believes, as other consensus historians do not, that the historian's job is to contribute to the completion of a cycle, "from adequate order through a period of excessive disorder and back again toward some satisfactory order."¹⁶

Berthoff's book is a classic statement in favor of consensus history, against a point of view which can still be called Progressive but can more properly be described as left-of-center by implication of not by design. The informing historical thesis against which Berthoff writes is best stated by Curtis P. Nettles in *The Roots of American*

"biography" of sovereignty are surprising in this context. Moreover, my own opinion is that we can expect a resurgence in the academy of more traditional and cohesive educational principles. For example, a group of influential academicians, have recently published what amounts to a manifesto, "The American Commonwealth, 1976" *The Public Interest*, No. 41 (Fall, 1975), in which they direct their attention to the recreation of authoritative national ideals. Contributors are: Robert Nisbet, Martin Diamond, Nathan Glazer, Irving Kristol, Samuel P. Huntington, Seymour M. Lipset, James Q. Wilson Aaron Wildavsky, Daniel Bell, and Daniel P. Moynihan. It represents an alteration in the general course of American culture at least at the academic level where most historical interpretation is conceived. Thus, although consensus history has been in disrepute over the past several years, it would not surprise me to see a resurgence of the interpretation.

¹⁶ Rowland Berthoff, *An Unsettled People: Social Order and Disorder in American History* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971), xiv. See also, Rowland Berthoff, "The American Social Order: A Conservative Hypothesis." *American Historical Review*, LXV (April, 1960), 495-514.

Civilization (1963) where one finds the assertion that conflict in the colonial world rose from "the trend toward the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of the few." Conflict, Nettles insists not consensus, has been the motivating force behind United States history, just as it is the force behind most history. Moreover, the conflict is qualitatively good for society. When their positions are compared, Berthoff and Nettles provide a good setting for the chief quarrel in revolutionary historiography: Progressive versus Whig, later conflict versus consensus.

II: *Conflict and Consensus in Revolutionary Historiography*

The plain implication of Progressive history has been that the world operates almost solely according to materialist principles. People act historically out of economic or other material motives such as power over the distribution of wealth. But, as Merrill Jensen pointed out in "Historians and the Nature of the American Revolution," the Progressive historians understood the differences between economic determinism and the economic interpretation of politics.¹⁷ Jensen, in a series of masterful works, has set forth several questions which dominate studies of the American Revolution at the mid-twentieth century. In the first of his works, *The Articles of Confederation: an Interpretation of the Social- Constitutional History of the American Revolution, 1774-1781* (1940), Jensen brought together local politics and national government. An agrarian federal democracy which was established under the Articles of Confederation was best suited to the desires of American revolutionaries. As the nation progressed, however, the radicals found themselves aligned against powerful nationalists who were interested in a strong central government, preservation from "the horrors of unchecked democracy," and the suppression of the internal rebellions which they anticipated. Those interested in local politics and local issues were thus lined up against those interested in national policies.

Ten years later Jensen published *The New Nation* in which he described the achievement of a "conservative counter-revolution" by the nationalist forces and the temporary eclipse of internal divisions when the United States Constitution was created. In 1966 Jensen published the capstone of his work, *The Founding of a Nation*, which traced the development of local issues and politics in the colonies and in England, carefully relating issues to the rise of colonial radicalism between 1763 and 1776. Jensen's work did not disregard the role of ideology and the transmission of ideas, but he remained close to the Progressive tradition enunciated by Carl Becker in the *Declaration of Independence* (1922)) the colonials "modified their theory to suit their needs." Jensen saw no transcendent ideals in the American Revolution. For him the real questions were: what internal (local) divisions are evident? what political activity surrounded these

¹⁷ Merrill Jensen, "Historians and the Nature of the American Revolution," in Ray Allen Billington, ed., *The Reinterpretation of Early American History: Essays in honor of John Edwin Pomfret* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1968), 121.

divisions? was it economic or libertarian, materialist or idealist? as politics democratic or elitist? when and why?¹⁸

Internal divisions, of course, arise from more than politics. Indeed, the assumption of most scholars is that politics will reflect internal divisions. If politics is stormy and if there is an upheaval in government, some deep divisions must exist in society. James Franklin Jameson thought so when he published his *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement* (1926), a companion to Beard's work in the ongoing argument. Jackson Turner Main, a student of Jensen, used Beard, Jameson, Nettles and Jensen as points of departure for his *The Social Structure of Revolutionary America* (1966), a pioneering statistical work on American society at the time of the revolution. Main's avowed purpose was to discuss not only the distinction between economic classes but also the existence in the British colonies of a prestige order.

Main found little evidence of class consciousness among the colonials especially in subsistence farming areas and at the frontier.¹⁹ On the other hand, in commercial farming areas and in the colonial towns, Main found "decisive evidence" of an economic class structure, hence, a "prestige order" that was based upon a "consciousness of class distinctions." Societies in these areas were aristocratic rather than democratic, and little mobility existed. Yet, a class of free workers, non-property owners, belonged to a mobile group, geographically and economically. They could reasonably expect to move up into a middle-class position in economy and society. This middle-class group comprised about seventy percent of colonial society, and Main further divided it into a marginal group of twenty percent, a middle-middle of forty percent, and an upper-middle of ten percent. Occupationally, this group consisted of farmers whose holdings were small, and craftsmen or artisans who were skilled workmen and who could not expect to rise above the middle level of comfort (cordwainer, cooper, blacksmith, tailor, weaver, carpenter).

Prosperous farmers, or commercial farmers, a few artisans in the strong capital trades like distillers, ropemakers, goldsmith, and men in professional occupations, could expect to rise above the middle of this economic class. A few lawyers, merchants and farmers with large holding belonged to the upper class in colonial British America. These comprised about ten percent of the population, although it varied from colony to colony. This ten percent controlled generally forty-five percent of the wealth in the North and fifty percent of the wealth in the South. Hence, classes existed, in some cases they were fairly rigid, but most colonials could reasonably expect some mobility.²⁰

¹⁸ Merrill Jensen, *The Articles of Confederation: An Interpretation of the Social-Constitutional History of the American Revolution, 1774-1781* (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1940); *The New Nation: A History of the United States during the Confederation, 1781-1789* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950); *The Founding of a Nation: A History of the American Revolution, 1763-1776* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966). Jensen's last book has been less influential than the earlier works, but in it he makes clear the importance of local history and detailed analysis of both personalities and local issues. My opinion is that it is the most informative of the three.

¹⁹ Jackson Turner Main, *The Social Structure of Revolutionary America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), 270.

²⁰ Main, *Social Structure*, 276.

In light of Main's findings reexaminations of political structure and function become particularly interesting. J.R. Pole and Richard Buel Jr. both suggested what Jack P. Greene has called "a massive and incomprehensible paradox."²¹ Political power existed among the less wealthy and less meritorious, but it was used to place in office those who held high prestige in the community, usually wealthy people, but not always. Materialism and class conflict in politics were thus called into serious question, not because there were no classes but because there was substantial agreement on who should rule. Bernard Bailyn also found a set of community values which did not deny class divisions in society, but saw such divisions as important in the determination of prestige orders. This concept emerged in the mid-1960's as "deference" politics, a position about midway between the consensus ideal of extant democracy and the conflict ideal of classes in vicious, sometimes violent, competition for power. In short, deference, inserted into the debate, provided common ground which tended to pull together the two schools.

A move away from the rigidity of historiographical positions was evident, too, in Jackson Turner Main's *The Antifederalists: Critics of the Constitution, 1781-1788* (1961) and earlier in a review of Forrest McDonald's *We the People: The Economic Origins of the Constitution* (1958), as well as in work by Lee Benson, *Turner and Beard: American Historical Writing Reconsidered* (1960). Beard had asserted that the Philadelphia convention represented property, but McDonald, after going over the materials, disagreed. He found that geographical areas and group interests were represented (not class interests) and that no consolidated economic group from around the colonies was in control of the convention. Most economic interests among the delegates were circumscribed by state boundaries and the convention, as well as the subsequent contest for ratification, was "at once a contest and thirteen contests."²²

²¹ Greene, "Reappraisal," 30. Greene is here citing the two most cited works, J. R. Pole, "Historians and the Problem of Early American Democracy," *American Historical Review*, LXVII (April, 1962), 626-646; Richard Buel, Jr., "Democracy and the American Revolution: A Frame of Reference," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd S., XXI (April, 1964), 164-190. Since Greene's article, Pole has published his excellent *Foundations of American Independence: 1763-1815* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1972), a comprehensive analysis in which his general orientation provides a solid background of ideas. Buel has published *Securing the Revolution: Ideology in American Politics, 1789-1815* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1972). See also J. R. Pole, *Representation in England and the Origins of the American Republic* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966). These author's ideas depend in part on Caroline Robbins, *The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman: Studies in the Transmission, Development and Circumstance of English Liberal Thought from the Restoration of Charles II until the War with the Thirteen Colonies* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959).

²² Forrest McDonald, *We the People: The Economic Origins of the Constitution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958) 357; Lee Benson, *Turner and Beard: American Historical Writing Reconsidered* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960); Jackson Turner Main, *The Antifederalists: Critics of the Constitution, 1781-1788* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1961). The interesting aspect of the quarrel over ratification of the Constitution is that the opponents accept generally the same method of analysis. Hence, Main's work has been a further refinement of work which Beard began and McDonald carried forward into a more specific analysis. Bailyn, Pole, Buel and others break out of the economic mode while Jensen very sensibly sticks to politics. McDonald has provided perhaps the greatest impetus for local or state studies of politics, but few of them have been in sufficient depth to critique his own analysis.

Main moved away from the economic distinction which both Beard and McDonald had used. He sought prestige as a causative factor, his arguments were local (but not geographical), and he suggested that many of the Antifederalists were wealthy persons whose interest lay in local self-rule. These persons gained support among those whose land holdings were small and who *seemed* to be interested in greater democratic control. Hence, the dispute was neither a class dispute nor a dispute bounded by states. Rather it was a dispute between people whose interests were commercial and people whose interests non-commercial—expansionists versus localists.

In the same vein, Lee Benson took McDonald's interpretation to be itself a narrowing of possibilities. McDonald had interpreted the Constitutional Convention in terms of narrow state or parochial interests, but Benson suggested broadening the agrarian/capitalist dichotomy in Beard's analysis. One could discern in the Convention a group of the "agrarian-minded" who were basically satisfied with the Articles of Confederation and who were opposed to the "commercial-minded." This second interest group desired a strong central government that could support commerce and national economic growth. In broadest terms, Benson found, the dispute was about what sort of society would be established in the United States, a society of growth and locale or a society of investment and nation-wide interests. McDonald carried the fight further in his *E Pluribus Unum: The Formation of the American Republic 1776-1790*, where he came closer to Benson by reasserting his own perception of economic interests. Not the commercial-minded against the agrarian-minded, he suggested, but those who favored and understood economic development against those who were slow to recognize the potential of the nation: "to get More." By the mid-1960's, then, the opponents had moved fairly close to one another and were open to the "deference" argument which Pole, Buel and Bailyn advanced for the revolution and early national periods.

Opposing positions were pushed closer during the mid 1960's when the New Left historians began to ask questions about the "inarticulate masses" and to assert that the "deference" historians used "conservative" sources. Jesse Lemisch, for example, in a series of articles and reviews has criticized the whole approach to revolutionary history, suggesting somewhat vaguely, but with great fervor, that scholars must attempt to assess what the Revolution as a movement mean to those who fought it, not those who voted or those who talked.²³ Lemisch identifies these deference authors as neo-Whig or continuations of the consensus school.

Whatever their differences, most historians agreed that detailed local studies of colonial politics would help resolve some of these issues. Conflict, consensus, deference

²³ Most vocal in this complaint has been Jesse Lemisch, "The American Revolution Seen from the Bottom Up," in Barton Bernstein, ed., *Towards a New Past: Dissenting Essays in American History* (New York: Pantheon, 1968), 3-45. Lemisch has also published other articles, "New York's Petitions and Resolves of December 1765: Liberals vs. Radicals," *New York Historical Society Quarterly*, XXIX (1965), 313-326; "Jack Tar in the Streets: Merchant Seamen in the Politics of Revolutionary America," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd S., XXV (July, 1968), 371-407; "Listening to the 'Inarticulate!' William Widger's Dream and the Loyalties of American Revolutionary Seamen in British Prisons," *Journal of Social History*, III (Fall, 1969), 1-29. Lemisch's statement on the "inarticulate" has given rise to one of those childish quibbles which from time to time take up so much energy.

and the "inarticulate masses" might emerge more clearly from such studies, and questions about diverse groups, interests, prestige and class would almost certainly be clarified. Such local studies are characteristic of one type of monograph which has been appearing over the past several years. Some of the more important studies are treated here. They display both distinctions and similarities in local politics, and those which are cited are typical.

New Hampshire politics is the topic of Jere R. Daniell's *Experiment in Republicanism: New Hampshire Politics and the American Revolution, 1741-1794* (1970). Daniell's study concentrates on high politics in the late colonial period. He has covered more than fifty years adequately. Even though he fails to concentrate on some central issues, he does provide insight into the power of royal government in the American colonies and the problems colonials encountered when they sought to establish executive lines of authority. He is able to tell us that in the years before the Revolution, New Hampshire lacked broad representation. As the Revolution progressed in the state, some leaders of the rebellion reacted against the wealthy and powerful, some issues found merchants battling farmers, democratic reforms were established. popular criticism seems to have been heeded by the leadership. On the whole, however, Daniell finds that "kinship pattern, sectional interests, personal ambition, the desire for social order, constitutional beliefs disappointed expectations and irrational fears" as well as the added problems of a rapidly growing population added much to the political struggles in the state.²⁴ Although Daniell's study is in no sense definitive, it does add to earlier studies and provides an excellent departure point for further study.²⁵

Three perspectives on Massachusetts history provide new insights to politics in the most radical of the revolutionary colonies. Two of these concern political parties. Stephen E. Patterson, *Political Parties in Revolutionary Massachusetts* (1973) and Van Beck Hall, *Politics without Parties: Massachusetts, 1780-1791* (1970). Patterson's argument is similar to Jackson Turner Main's in his work on political parties: parties existed in pre as well as post-Revolutionary Massachusetts. Patterson finds a court and a country party which represent basically an east/west split, a split which becomes more apparent as English control declines. Hence, he finds conflict between sections in Massachusetts, but finds neither court nor country party dedicated to any particular political ideal.²⁶ Hall finds a commercial/non-commercial split in the politics of the

²⁴ Jere R. Daniell, *Experiment in Republicanism: New Hampshire Politics and the American Revolution, 1741-1794* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), x-xi.

²⁵ Daniell's most important contribution lies in his exposition of complexity in the politics of New Hampshire. The Wentworth family did not completely control politics in the state as one would believe from David Hackett Fisher's assertion, *Revolution of American Conservatism* (New York: Harper & Row, Publisher, 1965), xiii. Forrest McDonald provides some insight into New Hampshire politics in *We the People*. Other studies may be consulted: William H. Fry, *New Hampshire as a Royal Province* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1908); Jeremy Belknap, *History of New Hampshire*, 3 vols. (Boston: Bradford and Read, 1813/1791-1792). New Hampshire represents a rich area of unexamined materials and political developments.

²⁶ Stephen E. Patterson, *Political Parties in Revolutionary Massachusetts* (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1973); Van Beck Hall, *Politics Without Parties: Massachusetts, 1780-1791* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1972); Dirk Hoerder, *Society and Govern-*

state. He agrees with Patterson that little ideology was involved. Conflict existed, to be sure, but not party conflict in any organized sense; it was factional conflict which moved toward the triumph of interest. Incidentally, Hall's work is based on excellent statistical resources and represents a masterful interpretation of them. Dirk Hoerder's study, *Society and Government 1760-1780: The Power Structure in Massachusetts Townships* (1972) also uses excellent statistical information which has been collected over the past few years. It is not surprising that he finds the wealthy in higher offices, and poorer people in lower offices. He does find a more equitable distribution of office holding in the smaller towns, but fails to interpret his finding.

These three studies are more meaningful when one considers a regional study which centers on Massachusetts, although for a later period. James M. Banner in *To the Hartford Convention: The Federalist and the Origins of Party Politics in Massachusetts, 1789-1815*, explains that in its best radical tradition, Massachusetts was a seedbed of dissent during the War of 1812. Banner implies that the dissent rested on a Federalist ideology. Federalism was congenial to New England as a "regional" ideology which supported exclusivism, nativist attitudes, Puritanism and republicanism from a local rather than a national perspective. Moreover, he suggests, the politically aware in Massachusetts found in Federalism an organic order, and their adherence to it was a natural outgrowth of the New England parochialism. This study provides an interesting and, in a way, logical argument which cuts through the conflict/consensus quarrel by isolating not only a regional ideology but also the politics which might have developed from it.²⁷

Irwin H. Polishook's study, *Rhode Island and the Union, 1774-1795* (1969), provides similar insights for the smallest colony.²⁸ Polishook's major contribution is his thesis that Rhode Island's reluctance to join the union stemmed from the influence of the American Revolution. He finds not just the local independence for which Rhode Island is famous in U.S. history, but also a legacy of popular control which found fertile ground in this colony. Polishook thus speaks to a local political culture which was itself radical and contentious. Moreover, in the documents he sees evidence of a

ment, 1760-1780: The Power Structure in Massachusetts Townships (Berlin: John F. Kennedy Institute, Freie Universität Berlin, 1972). See also Richard D. Brown, *Revolutionary Politics in Massachusetts* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), Christopher Collier, *Roger Sherman's Connecticut: Yankee Politics and the American Revolution* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1971).

²⁷ James M. Banner, *To the Hartford Convention: The Federalists and the Origins of Party Politics in Massachusetts, 1789-1815* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), fits rather closely with the analysis of Federalism provided in David Hackett Fisher, *The Revolution in American Conservatism*, which itself fits closely the concept of consensus. Banner's thesis, however, fits both the consensus theory and the strong localist conflict theory of the Progressives. In fact, it does draw them together by moving beyond the quarrel.

²⁸ Irwin H. Polishook, *Rhode Island and the Union, 1774-1795*, Northwestern University Studies in History, No. 5 (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1969), fits between David S. Lovejoy, *Rhode Island Politics and the American Revolution 1760-1776* (Providence: Brown University Press, 1958), and Peter J. Coleman, *The Transformation of Rhode Island* (Providence: Brown University Press, 1963). Like Connecticut, Rhode Island was a corporate colony, and politics among the populace was presumably affected by governmental structure. Most authors agree that independence characterized politics in the colony, but the same factional disputes which one finds in other New England colonies were present.

struggle between merchants from such trading centers as Providence and the inhabitants of the smaller country towns. Hence, in Rhode Island a doublelayered political culture existed. As in Massachusetts, there was local factional struggle about competing interests, but a fairly united orientation toward external or national questions.

New York has always been a key colony in the conflict/consensus battle. Carl Becker, Progressive historian, pioneered the study of the state and Staughton Lynd, a New Left historian, published an analysis of the conflict in Dutchess County before 1763.²⁹ In one of the most perceptive books to appear over the last decade Patricia U. Bonomi, *A Faction People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York* (1971), answers some complex questions about the colony. From Leisler's Rebellion in 1684 to the eve of the Revolution, Bonomi traces the development of a modern party system. Again, there is a two level analysis, first that factions existed in the colony and second that an ideology existed. But the ideology was a matter-of-fact acknowledgement that interests and power were legitimate goals. Issues were not constitutional, not even when two political cultures were in conflict as they were when the New Englanders squatted on the Phillips and Schuyler lands in the Hudson River Valley. From Bonomi's treatment, New York emerges as probably the most advanced colony politically if one thinks of modernization in terms of political parties. Like New Hampshire, New York was a royal colony where royal power was strong, but the famous family factions in the state apparently provided a depth of political experience.³⁰

²⁹ Carl Becker, *The History of Political Parties in the Province of New York*, began an intensive examination of New York politics. Party has been an important question, but ideology and social distinction in this most royal of the northern colonies have been important too. Staughton Lynd, *Class Conflicts, Slavery and the U. S. Constitution* (Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1967), brings together Lynd's studies on the political or social violence in Dutchess County. Lynd accepts a strong "class" orientation among the people who fought the great landlords of the Hudson Valley. For no other colony have the historiographical issues been clearer but the history has not been clarified by the several interpretive efforts. See also Alfred E. Young, *The Democratic Republicans of New York: The Origins, 1763-1797* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1967), and Bernard Friedman, "The Shaping of Radical Consciousness in Provincial New York," *Journal of American History*, LVI (March, 1970) 781-801, for restatement of ideologies in New York. An interesting political biography has recently appeared, Roger J. Champagne, *Alexander McDougall and the American Revolution in New York* (Schenectady, New York: The New York State Bicentennial Commission in conjunction with University College Press, distributed by Syracuse University Press, 1975). New York probably represents the colony where there was least deference; yet, the elite model prevails when one looks for actual control of politics. See Linda Grant De Pauw, *The Eleventh Pillar: New York State and the Federal Constitution* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1966).

³⁰ Patricia U. Bonomi, *A Faction People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971). See also Milton Klein, *Politics of Diversity: Essays in the History of Colonial New York* (Westport, New York: Kennikat Press, 1974). No general paper can hope to cover the diversity of New York's political and ideological or social elements, and I have not even tried. Becker, Lynd, Friedman and Young have been cited earlier, and although Bonomi and Lynd disagree on the "class consciousness" of the opponents in the rent strikes, both throw light on why the violence occurred and what it meant in the context of pre-Revolutionary New York. Similar statements can be made about New Jersey where groups of New Englanders were again in conflict with more sedate settlers. Yet, in a new study, Rudolph J. and Margaret C. Pasler, *The New Jersey Federalists* (Rutherford, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1975), find a familiar model, two factions of a political elite involved in a struggle for power. In contrast Carl E. Prince, *New Jersey, Jeffersonian Republicans: The Genesis of an Early Party Machine, 1789-1817* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1964).

A second regional book. *The Middle Colonies and the Coming of the American Revolution* (1974), seeks to explain the strength of conservative power in the mid-Atlantic colonies. In this book, John A. Neuenschwander suggests that middle colonies were a distinct section, much like New England, and that the opposition to radicalism in these colonies stemmed from both the experience of the Revolution and, more important, a fear of domination by the radical New Englanders. That those who opposed the radical demands were those who appreciated the benefits of empire is clear, and that many people feared the New England radicals is certainly true. Neuenschwander's attempt to bring together these ideas into a cohesive regional "consciousness" is not so clear, but, like Banner's argument, it explains some of the attitudinal conflict which surrounds the coming of the Revolution in this region.³¹

Maryland has been somewhat neglected by scholars. A recent publication, Ronald Hoffman's *A Spirit of Dissent: Economics, Politics and the Revolution in Maryland* (1974) is interesting and enlightening. Revolutionary Maryland was ruled by a colonial elite which rejected independence initially, later came to accept it, but retained both their elite status and firm control of state politics. Yet, Hoffman does speak of a popular movement that was created in colonial politics by the famous schedule of tobacco inspection fees which led the lower house to object to political organization in the colony.³² The quarrel that developed between the lower and upper houses in Maryland grew more heated when a general depression in Europe affected tobacco prices and grain markets.

These pressures resulted in a celebrated newspaper war between Charles Carroll of Annapolis and Daniel Dulany. Old animosities flared as the quarrel grew public: religious and political prescriptions against Catholics, family preferences or privileges in the politics of Maryland, personal matters. But the issue came to be the governor, representative of the proprietors, and his collusion with the upper house, the council, whose members stood to benefit financially from the fee proclamation. In 1773 the new "popular party" as it was called, defeated the aristocratic Dulany party. A languishing tobacco economy forced the governor and council to work with this antagonistic group of legislators. But even as they brought the government to heel, these "popular" gentlemen came to fear the growing revolutionary movement in Maryland and the surrounding colonies. In Maryland, then, the local political upheavals were precipitated by personal and religious disputes between prominent families and by

³¹ John A. Neuenschwander, *The Middle Colonies and the Coming of the American Revolution* (Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1974). Also interesting in this context is Milton Klein, *Politics of Diversity*. Pennsylvania politics has been of particular interest to the Progressive historians because the first constitution was the most democratic in all the colonies, see Robert L. Brunhouse, *The Counter-Revolution in Pennsylvania, 1776-1790* (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical Commission, 1942), and David Hawke, *In the Midst of a Revolution* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961), for an outline of competing forces in the colony.

³² Ronald Hoffman, *A Spirit of Dissent: Economics, Politics and the Revolution in Maryland*, Maryland Bicentennial Studies (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1974); Edward C. Papenfuss, *In Pursuit of Profit: The Annapolis Merchants in the Era of the American Revolution, 1763-1805*, Maryland Bicentennial Studies (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1975).

economic pressures which, although they had a general importance for the empire, were viewed quite specifically in Maryland. By 1777 the Carrolls, now in politics actively, had nicely handled a series of "social convulsions." What is missing from Hoffman's book is any real analysis of these social uprisings, but he has outlined a successful mode of political action which may characterize other colonies or the regions of colonies.

Two other studies published in 1975 and 1973 respectively help shed light on Hoffman's findings. Edward C. Papenfuse's *In Pursuit of Profit: The Annapolis Merchants in the Era of the American Revolution, 1763-1805*, provides insight into a group who were part of the ruling elite. Papenfuse uses a biographical method to explain how Maryland society worked. David Curtis Skaggs's *Roots of Maryland Democracy, 1753-1776*, speaks directly to the question of deference and its role in politics. In a study of land-holding patterns, Skaggs finds that less than one-half of the white males owned land. Maryland was quite different from Massachusetts and other New England colonies, as well as from Virginia, immediately south of Maryland, where Robert E. and B. Katherine Brown found land ownership widespread among the population. In an agricultural world, then, Maryland seems to have been "different" from other colonies, but the differential political style may have operated much the same in all.³³ Skaggs's work could be extended into the Revolutionary and post-Revolutionary periods to see whether some change occurred.

Politics in the southern colonies also exhibited a pattern of deference, but little has been added to Jack P. Greene's *Quest for Power: The Lower Houses of Assembly in the Southern Royal Colonies, 1689-1776* (1963), which tells the familiar tale of powerful families, specific economic interests and factions. There were exceptions in the region, particularly in North Carolina where politics was turbulent and "a tradition of opposition to authority was firmly rooted in the habits and ideology of the colony."³⁴ Greene finds a dedication to independent action in these assemblies, and finds as well the source of high quality government during the political upheavals which came with the Revolution. In short, the assemblies were training grounds for government leadership. Deference seems to have been operative, then, in the South. Richard R. Beeman, *The Old Dominion and the New Nation, 1788-1801*, analyzes roll-call votes in the Virginia assembly and finds that during this early period the state was dominated by an oligarchy of planters and lawyers. N. K. Risjord in his review of Beeman's book notes that Beeman failed to explain the high turnover in the assembly, but a high turnover provides no argument against Beeman's interpretations unless one has an

³³ David Curtis Skaggs, *Roots of Maryland Democracy, 1753-1776* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Inc., 1973); Peter S. Onuf, ed., *Maryland and the Empire, 1773: The Antillon-First Citizen Letters*, Maryland Bicentennial Studies (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1974). Some contrast is provided in Philip A. Crowl, *Maryland During and After the Revolution: A Political and Economic Study* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1943), but it is very general. Thomas O'Brian Hanley, *Charles Carroll of Carrollton: The Making of a Revolutionary Gentleman* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1970), casts some light on the Revolution in the colony.

³⁴ Jack P. Greene, *The Quest for Power: The Lower Houses of Assembly in the Southern Royal Colonies, 1689-1776* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1963), 41.

election analysis on a constituency by constituency basis. Beeman's book points up the potential for election studies and what they can tell about politics, interest and ideology in the colonies.³⁵

One impressive work covers the committee system in South Carolina between 1719 and 1776. George Edward Frakes's *Laboratory for Liberty: The South Carolina Committee System, 1719-1776* (1970) is an examination of the groups which, when the British began to tighten control on the colonies after about 1763, took government into their own hands. When legitimate constitutional government was paralyzed after 1769, these committees developed into a "province-wide network of local extra-legal committees." Their efforts led ultimately to the South Carolina Declaration of Independence and the creation of South Carolina's constitution. Regulator movements on the frontiers moved naturally into this extra-legal system. Frakes suggests, and by 1775 the constitution of South Carolina was framed in function though not in law.³⁶

Consideration of Frakes's book brings up again the issue of constitutionalism. In a very exciting article, "Popular Uprisings and Civil Authority in Eighteenth-Century America," Pauline Maier examined the functional constitution of the eighteenth century. Her perspective was that violence, so widespread during this era in England and America, descended in legitimate developments from English common law. Violence was thus an "extra-legal" part of the constitution, acceptable when other constitutional channels seemed unavailable or when some particular goal was popularly "necessary." Maier later amplified her thesis in *From Resistance to Rebellion: Colonial Radicals and the Development of American Opposition to Britain, 1765-1776*, where she traced the history of events which led ultimately to the adoption of revolutionary methods in the

³⁵ Richard R. Beeman, *The Old Dominion and the New Nation, 1788-1801* (Lexington, Ky.: The University Press of Kentucky, 1972). N. K. Risjord, review in *Journal of Southern History*, XXXIX (May, 1973), 283-284. Deference and dominance present interesting problems. For example, Michael Kammen, *Deputies and Liberties: The Origins of Representative Government in Colonial America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969), finds the most dramatic developments in the assemblies in the late seventeenth century rather than between 1760 and 1775, that the development of government came not as a necessity but grew from constitutional structure. Of course, Beeman disagrees with the Browns' consensus study, *Virginia...: Democracy or Aristocracy?* His conclusions are much closer to Charles Sydnor, *Gentleman Freeholders: Political Practices in Washington's Virginia* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1952). Clarence L. Ver Steeg, "Historians and the Southern Colonies," in Billington ed., *Reinterpretation*, 81-99, makes two important points about southern history: first the southern colonies were more diverse than other conventional groupings, notably New England; second, the southern colonies and their varied history could benefit greatly from family studies such as Aubrey C. Land, *The Dualness of Maryland* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1955). A Progressive analysis of Virginia is provided by Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, *Give Me Liberty: The Struggle for Self-Government in Virginia* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1958).

³⁶ George Edward Frakes, *Laboratory for Liberty: The South Carolina Legislative Committee System, 1719-1776* (Lexington, Ky.: The University Press of Kentucky, 1970). Frakes findings are particularly interesting in light of Pauline Maier, *From Resistance to Revolution: Colonial Radicals and the Development of American Opposition to Britain, 1765-1776* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972). His findings do not contradict Richard Maxwell Brown, *The South Carolina Regulators* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1963). Regulator movements in North Carolina have recently been clarified by William S. Powell and James K. Hight, comp. and eds., *Regulators in North Carolina: A Documentary History, 1759-1776* (Raleigh: State Department of Archives and History, 1971). Greene, *Quest for Power*, is the best statement on North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, and his bibliographical essay on these colonies is very good, 502-504.

several colonies. Maier's work utilizes Bernard Bailyn's perceptions in a rather specific way to analyze what American political perceptions and actions meant in certain locales. Her thesis receives support from Hiller B. Zobel, *The Boston Massacre* (1974) which suggests that mobs were a Boston tradition and that the British soldiers who fired knew the mob. They quite properly feared for their lives.

These general perceptions of constitutional attitudes and functions contrast with the local studies which have been mentioned and fall prey to the objections of scholars like Jesse Lemisch.³⁷ Maier's work is a step in the direction of understanding the "mob", rescuing it from historical obscurity. Yet, if the mob is behaving "constitutionally", it is behaving according to the prescriptions of the ruling class. In contrast, New Left historians demand that questions be asked from outside the arena of legitimacy.

Other work on political attitudes also suggests changes in historical perceptions. Jack P. Greene found that most scholarship accepted revolutionization of colonial society only in the last decade before the revolution, but a number of scholars have begun to suggest that radical thought and attitudes formed earlier. They thus contribute to the general consensus theory that American history is unique. Alan Heimert, Richard Merritt and Lawrence Leder have all found either attitudes or constitutional concepts available before the events of the 1760's and 1770's. Merritt finds an "American consciousness" as early as the 1730's. Events in the later years merely acted as a catalyst for these nascent constitutional concepts, helped them coalesce into ideas of liberty and individual rights.³⁸ Nothing in the local studies examined here necessarily contradicts this assertion, but as scholars pursue local history over the next several years one hopes that they will give some attention to questions of identity and attitudes, questions which demand a particularly imaginative interpretation of materials.

At the bicentennial, then, students of U.S. history have acquired certain insights into this dominant historical quarrel. First, the formulations of the early Progressives were, to say the least, too rigid. Their dependence on materialist interpretations is made suspect by the deference school whose contributions cut across political, social and intellectual history to provide the currently dominant school of revolutionary studies. Richard Buel, Jr.'s *Securing the Revolution Ideology in American Politics, 1789-1815* (1972), carries the ideas of this school into the early national period through a complex analysis of political attitudes and public opinion. Second, several local studies, taken from several different points of view, reveal strong differences within colonial societies and between colonies. For example, Maryland was clearly more aristocratic than Mas-

³⁷ Jesse Lemisch, "Listening to the 'Inarticulate!'" is his most penetrating effort and the effort which is most at odds with Maier's basic thesis.

³⁸ Greene, "Reappraisal," 27, 31-33. Alan Heimert, *Religion and the American Mind from the American Mind from the Great Awakening to the Revolution* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966); Richard L. Merritt, *Symbols of American Community, 1735-1775* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966); Lawrence Leder, *Liberty and Authority: Early American Political Ideology, 1689-1763* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968). Two more general works tend toward the same view, an early nationality or early reaction to the English system, Carl Bridenbaugh, *The Spirit of '76: The Growth of American Patriotism Before Independence, 1607-1776* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), and Alan Rogers, *Empire and Liberty: American Resistance to British Authority, 1755-1763* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974).

sachusetts. This difference may have made Maryland more susceptible to social upheavals, but we cannot say that yet. Local studies reveal as well certain similarities. Often in colonial and revolutionary politics the colonials were apparently faced with a choice between a country and court party, a tweedle-dee and tweedle-dum choice if Jesse Lemisch is correct. Finally, in local politics progression is evident from local issues toward the structure of conflict. Only in Maryland, however, is there any evidence of deliberate and possibly sinister repression of social upheaval by the revolutionary aristocrats.

On the other hand, there are noticeable deficiencies in this historical epistemology, deficiencies of method. Scholars have available scientific and biographical tools to examine in greater detail the quarrels we do find among local populations. Only Jackson Turner Main has utilized colonial materials as effectively as we could reasonably expect. This author suspects, however, that shortly an avalanche of demographic and statistical studies will throw greater light on how, where and why people lived during the revolutionary era. Such configurations will probably shed considerable light on the material structure of local quarrels and local agreements about political and economic issues and, by inference, will shed light on the configuration of society and intellect in the revolutionary era. For example, scholars could refine their concepts of interest and thus examine more closely Bailyn's work on the ideology of the Revolution. Several recent monographs demonstrate this point.

J. E. Crowley, *This Sheba Self: The Conceptualization of Economic Life in Eighteenth-Century America* (1974). and E. A. J. Johnson, *The Foundations of American Economic Freedom: Government and Enterprise in the Age of Washington* (1973).³⁹ Both works examine the development of economic freedom, an important component, as most will agree, of the Declaration of Independence. Crowley finds a mixture of ideas about work. On the one hand, it was viewed as social, placing workers in society through their social rather than their economic utility. On the other hand, work was economic and, as Patricia Bonomi found in New York politics, the Sheba self or interest was acceptable. Work was morally neutral. Both values existed in colonial America, but traditional analysis of western civilization suggests that the social value of work inevitably lost ground to selfinterest. Such an argument brings to mind Rowland Berthoff's "conservative" social history.⁴⁰

E. A. J. Johnson presents an interesting argument which helps explain further

³⁹ J. E. Crowley, *This Sheba Self: The Conceptualization of Economic Life in Eighteenth-Century America*. The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, 2nd S., No. 92 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974); E. A. J. Johnson, *The Foundations of American Economic Freedom: Government and Enterprise in the Age of Washington* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1973). Two other interesting works: J. R. T. Hughes, *Social Control in the Colonial Economy* (Charlottesville, Va.: University Press of Virginia, 1975), and Ralph Davis, *This Rise of the Atlantic Economies* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1973).

⁴⁰ James Kirby Martin, *Men in Rebellion: Higher Governmental Leaders and the Coming of the American Revolution* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1973), James A. Henretta, *The Revolution of American Society, 1700-1815: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, Civilization and Society, Studies in Social, Economic and Cultural History (Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Co., 1973).

Benson's perceptions of interests. Four freedoms are evident in the constitutional period, a free market, free trade, free occupational choice and free investment. He finds these supported by merchants, agrarian interests, mechanics and speculators respectively. Undoubtedly Johnson's work is too schematized. Nevertheless, it provides a more complex theoretical view than Beard or Benson for those who wish to examine the economic aspects of the early national period.

Two other studies show what can be done by relying on the "new" French school of historical analysis. James Kirby Martin in *Men in Rebellion: Higher Governmental Leaders and the Coming of the American Revolution* (1973), suggests that the increased wealth of the British North Americans produced a "glut" of people who were potentially powerful, *nouveau riches* who entered society with the reasonable expectation of political office and deference. Their number produced a "crisis" in the structure of colonial politics, and the crisis as resolved when the colonials depersonalized the problem by saying that British appointees in the provinces designed to destroy liberty. Martin's debt to Bernard Bailyn is clear as is his dependence on deference as a basic political concept. Of course, his thesis would further refine deference. The model he presents will be interesting when it is applied at the most basic level of politics. Jams A. Henretta in *The Evolution of American Society, 1700-1815: An Interdisciplinary Approach* (1973) demonstrates what demographic studies can tell scholars about marketing practices, thus, about economic distribution and economic growth. Again, the potential for local application is immense, and, in conjunction with the work by Main, Bailyn, Pole and Buel. Henretta's effort could provide insights across the spectrum of topical and local history.

The rise of a deference concept has far from closed the quarrel between conflict and consensus historians, but the distinctions have become considerably blurred. As far as this author can tell, no one has yet taken up the New Left, Jesse Lemisch's and Staughton Lynd's efforts to understand the masses. The only effective answer to their objections seems to be that no one is quite sure that there were "masses" in the colonial and revolutionary period. This author's opinion is that scholars will have to move away from the particular, that is, from the actual historical model of investigation which is itself an Enlightenment legacy, and admit that "felt" extrapolations are admissible as scholarship, before they can meet and overcome the objections of the New Left. It is not impossible. Otherwise, by following the deference concept scholars of the American Revolution at the bicentennial year are progressing on a detailed history of what R. R. Palmer quite properly called the first bourgeois revolution.

III: Recent Topics, Documents and Personal Papers

Biographies continue to appear and to expand our knowledge of prominent revolutionaries and of second rank persons whose status was high during the era but who never went on to national prominence. Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton and George Washington have all been the topics of recent biographies. Jefferson is probably

the most written-about personality among the founding fathers. His chief biographer since 1948 has been Dumas Malone, *Jefferson and His Time*, and Malone has published Vol. IV: *Jefferson the President: First Term, 1801-1805* (1970) and Vol. V: *Jefferson the President: Second Term, 1805-1809*, (1974). Malone's view of Jefferson has been positive, and these two works do not change that. Of course, Jefferson's tenure as president was the most complicated part of his life. When Jefferson had to exercise power, he seems to have had the same problems that other men had who were presumably less capable. Malone slights some of these problems, but some come through despite Malone's well-known protectiveness. A second important biography, Merrill D. Peterson's *Thomas Jefferson and the New Nation: A Biography* (1970), is by the author's own statement an effort to synthesize other work on Jefferson. From Peterson's book, Jefferson emerges as an intelligent human being whose dedication to Enlightenment ideals and democracy allowed him to play his important part in the early national period. Peterson opted to leave footnotes out of his work. Nevertheless, it is a sound biography, fairly well focused for a thousand pages of information.⁴¹

By far the most interesting biographies to come out over the past several years are those which continue the revision of Alexander Hamilton. Broadus Mitchell provides us with a second "consensus" biography as part of the Leaders of the American Revolution Series for the Thomas Y. Crowell Co., *Alexander Hamilton: The Revolutionary Years* (1970), which covers Hamilton's military career. Yet, Mitchell provides a portrait of a man whose interests were wideranging and who developed an early concern for the financial plight of the colonies. This is an insightful biography, and although it lacks notes, scholars and teachers will do well to use it. Two other biographies seek to create an important niche for Hamilton as a statesman and diplomat. In her *Alexander Hamilton and the British Orientation of American Foreign Policy, 1783-1803* (1969), Helen Johnson Looze suggests that Hamilton followed a basic ideology in his orientation toward other nations. He was, she says, constantly seeking peace, national interest, neutrality, negotiation to avoid war and the obligation of contract. Looze's perceptions are interesting, but she fails to consider important aspects of Hamilton's career, and her thesis is thus unproved. Gilbert L. Lycan's *Alexander Hamilton and American Foreign Policy: A Design for Greatness* (1970) uses a similar argument. Lycan asserts that Hamilton consistently supported a predictable foreign policy with England, France and Spain. A third effort to resurrect Hamilton's reputation, this time in domestic affairs, comes from Gerald Stourzh, *Alexander Hamilton and the Idea of Republican Government* (1970). Stourzh argues that Hamilton

⁴¹ Dumas Malone, *Jefferson and His Time*, vol. IV: *Jefferson the President: First Term, 1801-1805*, vol. V: *Jefferson the President: Second Term, 1805-1809* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1970, 1974). Merrill D. Peterson, *Thomas Jefferson and the New Nation: A Biography* (New York: Oxford University Press 1970). Helen Crispe, *Thomas Jefferson and Music* (Charlottesville, Va.: University Press of Virginia, 1974), is an interesting late work. Jefferson continues to be the most explored of the founding fathers. Julian P. Boyd has issued two new volumes of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, Vol. 18: 4 November 1770 to 24 January 1791; Ruth W. Lester, asst. ed., Vol. 19: 24 June 1790 to 31 Mar 1791 (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1971, 1974), in which the high standards of detailed editing and notes have been continued.

pursued the reality of power through the love of fame, and that in his pursuit of it he was little different from his contemporaries Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and a later president, Abraham Lincoln. Pursuit of fame or of the public place is an idea that has been best explored by the late Hannah Arendt in her excellent examination of revolutionary principles, *On Revolution*. The influence of her ideas is evident in Stourzh's book.⁴²

Washington's biographer, James Thomas Flexner, published the third volume of his biography, *George Washington and the New Nation* (1970). Although Washington's politics are not as carefully covered as one might wish, all three volumes present a complex human being. A more negative view of Washington's terms as president is presented by Forrest McDonald, *The Presidency of George Washington*, (1974), but McDonald adds little to our knowledge of either the period or the man. Broadus Mitchell's biography, *The Price of Independence: A Realistic View of the American Revolution* (1974) is not properly a biography of Washington at all, but those who find interest in Washington's term as commander-in-chief will find the book rewarding.⁴³

Cecil B. Currey continues his critical assessment of Benjamin Franklin in *Code Number 2: Benjamin Franklin, Patriot or Spy?* (1972). Currey's answer, of course, is that Franklin was a spy for the British. Reviewers and critics have given Currey a good deal of criticism, but his thesis continues to receive positive attention. In contrast to Currey's Franklin, Benjamin H. Newcomb presents a more traditional historical

⁴² Broadus Mitchell, *Alexander Hamilton: The Revolutionary Years*, Leaders of the American Revolution Series (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1970), in which Mitchell continues his reassessment of Hamilton, from *Youth to Maturity* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1957), and *The National Adventure, 1788-1804*. Hamilton's story at the hands of historians possibly belongs to Part II of this paper because he was "resurrected" during the consensus years. David Hackett Fischer, *The Revolution of American Conservatism*, contributed to the general change of opinion about Hamilton. Helene Johnson Looze, *Alexander Hamilton and the British Orientation of American Foreign Policy, 1783-1803* (The Hague: Mouton and Co., distributed by Humanities Press, Inc., of New York, 1971), Gilbert L. Lycan, *Alexander Hamilton and American Foreign Policy: A Design for Greatness* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1970), and Gerald Stourzh, *Alexander Hamilton and the Idea of Republican Government* (Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press, 1970), all continue the general reassessment. See also recent volumes of Harold C. Syrett, *The Papers of Alexander Hamilton*, Vols. XIV-XIX (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969, 1969, 1972, 1972, 1972, 1973, 1973). Closely connected with Hamilton and the economic plan for the new nation was Robert Morris, and one should see E. James Ferguson, ed., *The Papers of Robert Morris, 1781-1784*, Vol. I: Feb 7-July 31, 1781 (Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973), of a projected sixteen volume series under the general editorship of Clarence Ver Steeg. Hannah Arendt's *On Revolution* (New York: The Viking Press, 1963) concerns John Adams and Thomas Jefferson more than Hamilton, but Stourzh's excellent grasp of the principle and his telling comparison between Hamilton and Abraham Lincoln is a service to all who are interested in political motivation and the nature of ideals in American culture.

⁴³ James Thomas Flexner, *George Washington and the New Nation* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1970), accompanies his first volume, *George Washington in the American Revolution, 1775-1783* (New York: Little Brown and Co., 1968). Also important, Esmond Wright, *Washington and the American Revolution* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1957). Broadus Mitchell, *The Price of Independence: A Realistic View of the American Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974). Forrest McDonald, *The Presidency of George Washington* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1974). Washington's earlier life is well covered in Bernhard Knollenberg, *George Washington: The Virginia Period, 1732-1775* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1964).

figure. In *Franklin and Galloway: A Political Partnership* (1972), Newcomb presents a man who is guided in all things by traditional Whig ideals: representation, equality for citizens, freedom of economic activity. Even Franklin's widely accepted pragmatism is unacceptable to Newcomb, and, overall, his very favorable picture of Franklin is as difficult to sustain as Currey's negative portrait is to accept.⁴⁴

Other biographies of influential figures have been published. Robert Douthart Meade has put out the second volume of his biography, *Patrick Henry: Practical Revolutionary*, (1969) and Richard R. Beeman's biography, *Patrick Henry: A Biography* (1974) is for general readers. Meade's work has been criticized for its anecdotal quality, but it is thoroughly interesting and readable. Although it does not replace Irving Brant's six volume study, Ralph Ketchman's *James Madison: A Biography* (1971) is an excellent background study of the fourth president who was the chief architect of so much political theory and structure. Ketchman's book provides insight into Madison's concern for the nation.⁴⁵

Harry Ammon has produced a significant work, *James Monroe: The Quest for National Identity*. Ammon's work is a necessary supplement, perhaps a replacement as the standard work, for William Penn Cresson's *James Monroe* (1946). New materials and new information have required another look at Monroe and Ammon's study brings him alive politically if not personally, as one reviewer objected. Ammon portrays well Monroe's relationships with Jefferson, Madison and other influential figures of the era.⁴⁶

Since the 1950's numerous biographies have been written about the lives of secondary characters and those who played minor roles in late colonial and early national politics. The last five years have seen several such biographies,⁴⁷ four of which deserve

⁴⁴ Cecil B. Currey, *Code Number 2: Benjamin Franklin, Patriot or Spy?* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972) and see Currey, *The Road to Revolution: Benjamin Franklin in England, 1765-1775* (New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1968). Benjamin H. Newcomb, *Franklin and Galloway: A Political Partnership* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972). Still standard is Carl Van Doren, *Benjamin Franklin: A Biography* (New York: Viking Press, 1956/1938). See also Leonard W. Labree, ed., *Franklin Papers*; Helen C. Boatfield and James H. Hutson, asst. eds., Vol. 11: January 1, 1764 through December 31, 1764; Vol. 12: January 1, 1765 through December 31, 1765; Vol. 13: January 1, 1766 through December 31, 1766; Vol. 14: January 1, 1767 through December 31, 1767; William B. Wilcox, ed., Dorothy W. Bridgewater, Mary L. Hart, Claude A. Lopez and G. B. Worden, asst. eds., Vol. 15: January 1, 1768 through December 31, 1768 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1972); latest in a fifteen year effort to publish the Franklin papers.

⁴⁵ Robert Douthart Meade, *Patrick Henry: Patriot in the Making* (New York: Lippincott, 1957), *Practical Revolutionary* (New York: Lippincott, 1969); Richard R. Beeman, *Patrick Henry: A Biography* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974). Recently reprinted, Moses Coit Tyler, *Patrick Henry* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1969/1908). Ralph Ketchman, *James Madison: A Biography* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1971). Irving Brant, *James Madison, The Virginia Revolutionist, 1751-1780; The Nationalist, 1780-1787; Father of the Constitution, 1787-1800; Secretary of State, 1800-1809; The President, 1809-1812; Commander in Chief, 1812-1836* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1941-1961), 6 vols.

⁴⁶ Harry Ammon, *James Monroe: The Quest for National Identity* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971), review by Bradford Perkins, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd S., XXIX (January, 1972) 161-162. Perkins suggests that this book replaces William Penn Cresson's *James Monroe* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1946).

⁴⁷ Charles A. Jellison, *Ethan Allen: Frontier Rebel* (Syracuse University Press, 1969). Max M. Mintz, *Gouverneur Morris and the American Revolution* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1970). David Freeman Hawke, Benjamin Rush: *Revolutionary Gadfly* (Indianapolis, Ind.: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1971). John J. Rearden, *Edmund Randolph: A Biography*

mention here. Charles A. Jellison, *Ethan Allen: Frontier Rebel* (1969) is an adequate biography of a Revolutionary War hero. Allen's military career is adequately covered, but his intellectual and political contributions are slighted. Max H. Mintz, *Gouverneur Morris and the American Revolution* (1970) is a synthesis of other work done on Morris, but it is an excellent book for the general reader. Also interesting for the general reader is David Freeman Hawke's *Benjamin Rush: Revolutionary Gadfly* (1971), but Hawke's book will be useful to the teaching specialist as well. John J. Rearden has produced an adequate biography, *Edmund Randolph: A Biography* (1975).

Collections of documents and papers continue to come out.⁴⁸ Over the last several years three new and significant series have appeared: *The Saltonstall Papers*, Robert E. Moody, ed., Vol. I: 1607-1789. Vol. II: 1791-1815. (1972, 1974); *The Papers of John Marshall*, Herbert A. Johnson, ed., Vol. I: Correspondence and Papers, November 10, 1775-June 23, 1788, and Account Book, September, 1783-June, 1788 (1974); *Documents of the American Revolution, 1770-1783*, K. G. Davis, ed., Vol. I: Calendar 1770-1791. Vol. II: Transcripts 1770. Vol. III: Transcripts 1771 (1972). Papers such as the *Saltonstall Papers* will aid immensely in the continuous history of an im-

(New York Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1975). Robert D. Arbuckle, *Pennsylvania Speculator and Patriot: The Entrepreneurial John Nickolson, 1757-1800* (University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University Press with the cooperation and support of the Pennsylvania Historical and support of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1975). Edmund and Dorothy Smith Berkeley, *John Beckley: Zealous Partisan in a Nation Divided*, Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 100 (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1973). John Richard Alden, *Robert Dinwiddie: Servant of the Crown* (Williamsburg, Va.: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, distributed by the University Press of Virginia, 1973). Frank A. Cassells, *Merchant Congressman in the Young Republic: Samuel Smith of Maryland, 1752-1839* (Madison, Wisc.: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1971). John M. Coleman, *Thomas McKean: Forgotten Leader of the Revolution* (Rockaway, New Jersey: American Faculty Press with the cooperation of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1975). Emory G. Evans, *Thomas Nelson of Yorktown: Revolutionary Virginian* (Williamsburg, Va.: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, distributed by the University Press of Virginia, 1975). William M. Fowler, *William Ellery: A Rhode Island Politico and Lord of the Admiralty* (Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1973). Helen Hill Miller, *George Mason: Gentleman Revolutionary* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1975). Helen R. Pinkney Christopher Gore: *Federalist of Massachusetts, 1758-1827* (Barre, Mass.: Barre Publishing Co., for Gore Place Society, Waltham, Massachusetts 1969).

⁴⁸ Continuing series or recent publications of minor interest are: George H. Reese, compiler, *The Cornwallis Papers: Abstracts of Americana*, Virginia Independence Bicentennial Publications No. 2 (Charlottesville, Va.: The University Press of Virginia for the Independence Bicentennial Commission, 1970). Robert A. Rutland, ed., *The Papers of George Mason, 1725-1792*, Vol. I: 1749-1778; Vol. II: 1779-1786; Vol. III: 1787-1792 (Chapel Hill, N. C.: The University of North Carolina Press, published for the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America, the Board of Regents of Gurston Hall and the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1970). Robert J. Taylor, ed., *The Susquehanna Company Papers*, Vol. X: 1789-1800; Vol. XI: 1801-1808. Sheldon Reynolds Memorial Publications (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, for the Wyoming Historical and Geological Society, Willkes-Barre, Pa., 1971). Philip M. Hamer and George Rogers, Jr., eds., *The Papers of Henry Laurens*, Volume Two: November 1, 1755-December 31, 1758; Volume Three: January 1, 1759-August 31, 1763 (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, published for the South Carolina Historical Society, 1970, 1972). L. H. Butterfield and Marc Friedlaender, eds., *The Adams Papers*, Series II, Vol. 3: April 1778-Sept., 1780; Vol. 4: October 1780-Sept., 1782 and Index (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1973). Malcolm Freiberg, ed., *Journals of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts*, Vol. XLI: 1764-1765; Vol. XLII: 1765-1766; Vol. XLIII, Part I: 1766, Part 2: 1767 (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974). For other papers see individual biographical statements.

portant family which contributed to the history of New England and the nation. Marshall's papers had not been available in any collection until this time, and Johnson has done a superb job, both inclusive and focused, which provides an excellent portrait of John Marshall the Federalist.⁴⁹

In a review of Davis's documents Merrill Jensen notes that Davis takes a perspective on the empire and attempts to "recreate" the situation in which the secretary of state and the Board of Trade corresponded with the British colonies in North America.⁵⁰ These three volumes are the first of a projected eighteen volume set.

A few significant books which fall into a general category of "minority" history have appeared. One of these is significant because it has received so much publicity, Richard Van der Beets, *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives, 1642-1836* (1973), is largely a republication of narratives which have appeared elsewhere. This author's opinion is that the book should be praised for its contribution to collections, but its significance is questionable. Three other works are significant: Barbara Graymont, *The Iroquois in the American Revolution* (1972); James H. O'Donnell, *Southern Indians in the American Revolution* (1973); Duncan J. MacLeod, *Slavery, Race and the American Revolution* (1974). Graymont's work is an excellent example of a combined anthropological and historical approach to such study and scholars who are expert in the field have called it a definitive study. Of slightly less importance, O'Donnell's study of the southern Indians was written as an extension of John Alden's earlier work, *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier, 1754-1775* (1944), and provides a fresh survey of the topic.

MacLeod's falls into the categories of social and intellectual history. His thesis is that the obvious contradictions between a libertarian philosophy and the institution of slavery led the revolutionary generation to justify slavery on racial grounds. A significant new work by Edmund Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom* (1975) studies the same problem in a context which stresses the exploitation of labor. Morgan's book emphasizes the experience of Virginians and stops with the revolutionary years while MacLeod's book extends the story to about 1820. Morgan's is the broader view because he begins his study with the very early labor problems which Virginian settlers faced at Jamestown, but the two works form an interesting combination of ideas.⁵¹

⁴⁹ Robert E. Moody, ed., *The Saltonstall Papers*, Vol. I: 1607-1789; Vol. II: 1791-1815, Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, Vols. 80, 81 (Boston: For the Society, 1972, 1974). Herbert A. Johnson, ed., *The Papers of John Marshall*, Vol. I: Correspondence and Papers, November 10, 1775-June 23, 1788; Account Book September, 1783-June, 1788 (Williamsburg: The Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1974). A new popular biography of Marshall is available, Leonard Baker, *John Marshall: A Life in Law* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1974), but the standard is still Albert J. Beveridge, *The Life of John Marshall*, 4 Vols. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916-1919).

⁵⁰ K. G. Davies ed., *Documents of the American Revolution, 1770-1783*, Colonial Office Series, Vol. I: Calendar 1770-1771; Vol. II: Transcripts 1770; Vol. III: Transcripts 1771 (Shannon Ireland: Irish University Press, 1972). Merrill Jensen, review in *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd S., XXXI (October, 1974), 683-684.

⁵¹ Barbara Graymont, *The Iroquois in the American Revolution* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1972); James H. O'Donnell, *Southern Indians in the American Revolution* (Knoxville, Tenn.: The University of Tennessee Press, 1973); Duncan J. MacLeod, *Slavery, Race and the American Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974); Edmund Morgan,

As several historians have pointed out lately there was another side in the American Revolution: the English and the loyalist citizens of the colonies. The top is a good place to begin. Two interesting work on George III have appeared since 1969, Ida Macalpine and Richard Hunter, *George III and the Mad-Business* (1970) and John Brooke, *King George III* (1972). Macalpine and Hunter have provided a controversial medical explanation of George III's lapses into apparent madness: he was not mad, rather he suffered from porphyria, a rare disease which affects the nervous system and produces spells of delirium. The disease is hereditary, and hence seems to fit the early Hanoverian line. Overall, the argument has been accepted, and John Brooke uses it to dispell some myths about George III: he was not stupid, he was not mad, and so forth. Brooke's work is designed for the popular audience, but it should be interesting to teaching scholars because it brings the King to life by portraying a man of average intelligence caught in extraordinary circumstances and fulfilling quite well his duties and responsibilities. Two administrative histories have appeared which detail English effort in the war, David Syrett, *Shipping and the American War, 1775-1783: A Study of British Transport Organization* (1970), and Norman Baker, *Government and Contractors: The British Treasury and War Supplies, 1775-1783* (1972), both competent examinations of administrative problems.

Mary Beth Norton's *The British-Americans: The Loyalist Exiles in England, 1774-1789* (1972) has quickly become an accepted statement on the topic because it contains a cohesive explanation of policy toward British colonials who supported the empire; Two other works are more general and both are good syntheses of earlier statements. Wallace Brown, *The Good Americans: The Loyalists in the American Revolution* (1969), replaced William Nelson's *American Tory* (1961), and although it does not supplant Brown's work, Robert B. Calhoun's *The Loyalist in Revolutionary America, 1760-1781* (1973) provides an excellent synthesis of current work.⁵²

American Slavery, American Freedom (New York: W. W. Norton, 1975); Richard Van Der Beets, *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives, 1642-1836* (Knoxville, Tenn.: The University of Tennessee Press, 1973). Other sources remain useful to studies of racial minorities during the period: Robert M. McColey, *Slavery and Jeffersonian Virginia* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1964); Benjamin Quarles, *The Negro in the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1961); Howard H. Peckham, *Pontiac and the Indian Uprising* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947); Bernard W. Sheehan, "Indian-White Relations in Early America: A Review Essay," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd S., XXVI (April, 1969); John R. Alden, *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier...*, 1754-1775 (Ann Arbor Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1944); Jack Sosin, *Revolutionary Frontier, 1763-1783* (New York: Holt Rinehard and Winston, 1967).

⁵² Ida Macalpine and Richard Hunter, *George III and the Mad-Business* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1970); John Brooke, *King George III* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1972); David Syrett, *Shipping and the American War, 1775-83: A Study of British Transport Organization* (London: The Athlone Press, 1970); Norman Baker, *Government and Contractors: The British Treasury and War Supplies, 1775-1783* (London: The Athlone Press, University of London, distributed by Oxford University Press of New York, 1972); Mary Beth Norton, *The British-Americans: The Loyalist Exiles in England, 1774-1789* Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1972); Wallace Brown, *The Good Americans: The Loyalists in the American Revolution* (New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc., 1969); Robert McCluer Calhoun, *The Loyalists in Revolutionary America, 1760-1781* (New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1973). Other books relating to loyalists or part of the American empire which remained loyal are: Gordon Stewart and George Rawlyk, *A People Highly Favored of God: The Nova Scotia Yankees and the American*

Kings and loyalists also point up the war. Military historians are prolific, and they often produce works which emphasize important diplomatic, constitutional and social aspects of history. William C. Stinchcombe has produced a work, *The American Revolution and the French Alliance* (1969) which is not a military history; yet, it concentrates on the period of the Revolutionary War, and brings together military and diplomatic problems. *The American Campaigns of Rochambeau's Army, 1780, 1781, 1782, 1783*, Howard C. Rich Jr. and Anne S. K. Brown, eds., Vol. I: *The Journals of Clermont-Crevecoeur, Verger and Berthier* Vol. II: *The Itineraries, Maps and Views* (1972), have been published for the first time and cast some light on Franco-American relations. Ira D. Gruber, *The Howe Brothers and the American Revolution* (1972), and George Athan Billias, ed., *George Washington's Opponents: British Generals and Admirals in the American Revolution* (1969) are significant contributions, the first for its advance over earlier work and the second for its series of outstanding essays.⁵³ Howard H. Peckham, ed., *The Toll of Independence: Engagements and Battle Casualties of the Revolution* (1974) will be an indispensable reference work for those who wish to assess the Revolutionary War.

Three works which are properly called military history have contributed to our understanding of society and the military. Don Higginbotham, *The War of American*

Revolution (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1972), an interesting functional analysis of revivalism and its contribution to the loyalism of the Nova Scotia Yankees; Cyril Hamshire, *The British in the Caribbean* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972), a restatement of earlier material in popular form; and two biographies which have received some scholarly acclaim, Bernard Bailyn, *The Ordeal of Thomas Hutchinson* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1974), and Carol Berkin, *Jonathan Sewall: Odyssey of an American Loyalist* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974). This list must necessarily include some earlier works: Richard Pares, *King George III and the Politicians* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953), which more properly belongs in a discussion of imperial policy; William H. Nelson, *The American Tory* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), supplanted now by Brown's study.

⁵³ William C. Stinchcombe, *The American Revolution and the French Alliance* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1969). Howard C. Rice, Jr. and Anne S. K. Brown, eds., *The American Campaigns of Rochambeau's Army, 1780, 1781, 1782, 1783*, Vol. I: *The Journals of Clermont-Crevecoeur, Verger and Berthier*; Vol. II: *The Itineraries, Maps and Views*, (Princeton University Press and Brown University Press, 1972). Ira D. Gruber, *The Howe Brothers and the American Revolution* (New York: Atheneum, for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1972). George Athan Billias, ed., *George Washington's Opponents: British Generals and Admirals in the American Revolution* (New York: William Norrow and Co., Inc., 1969). Howard H. Peckham, ed., *The Toll of Independence: Engagements and Battle Casualties of the Revolution*, Clements Library Bicentennial Studies (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974). Other documents and studies have recently appeared: *Naval Documents of the American Revolution* (Washington, D. C.: 1964-present); Charles H. Metzger, S. J., *The Prisoner in the American Revolution* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1971); Marshall Smelser, *The Winning of Independence*, The Quadrangle Bicentennial History of the American Revolution (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1972), a book for the general reader; John W. Jackson, *The Pennsylvania Navy, 1775-1781: The Defense of the Delaware* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1974); Nathan Miller, *Sea of Glory: The Continental Navy Fights for Independence, 1775-1783* (New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1974). Several military biographies have appeared: Martin H. Bush, *Revolutionary Enigma: A Re-appraisal of General Philip Schuyler of New York*, Empire State Historical Publications, Series No. 80 (Port Washington, New York: Ira J. Friedman, Inc., 1969); Franklin and Mary Wickwire, *Cornwallis: The American Adventure* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1970), which more properly belongs with the studies on the British; Christopher McKee, *Edward Preble: A Naval Biography, 1761-1807* (Annapolis, Maryland: Naval Institute Press, 1972); Hugh F. Rankin, *Francis Marion: The Swamp Fox* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1973).

Independence: Military Attitudes, Policies and Practices, 1763-1789, demonstrates that the military during the Revolution reflected quite well the structure of society. But he does more. He demonstrates an interplay between social needs and military policies. That such an interrelationship is present should surprise no one, but that it can be demonstrated in a volume of 500 pages makes this an important contribution to Revolutionary history and to military history in general. Another book of similar importance is Hugh F. Rankin's *The North Carolina Continentals* (1971), which places the colonial militia in the context of their home state. Both of these works are military history at its best. A third history, much broader in conception, is Douglas Edward Leach, *Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America, 1607-1763* (1973) which has been unevenly received by other military scholars.⁵⁴

Finally, two works should be mentioned which fit into no specific category or topic. Ivor Noel Hume, *A Guide to the Artifacts of Colonial America* (1970), provides a companion to his earlier work, *Historical Archaeology* (1969). In the earlier work Hume explained the step-by-step process of excavations. In this one he explains the possibilities of seventeenth—and eighteenth—century sites, what to expect in terms of dates, articles and so forth for the colonial period as well as the revolutionary period. William P. Cumming has performed fundamental work in his *British Maps of Colonial America* (1974) where he makes easily accessible for the first time a quantity of important cartographic material.⁵⁵

Finally, this author wishes to say again that nothing in this brief review is definitive. State bicentennial committees have commissioned works not mentioned here, and other monographs as well as journal literature will continue to alter our perceptions of the politics, the personalities and the issues. Scholars will continue to disagree, and in the long run the disagreement will bring greater clarity to our understanding of the American Revolutionary Era.

Eldon P. Turner

⁵⁴ Hugh F. Rankin, *The North Carolina Continentals* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1971); Don Higginbotham, *The War of American Independence: Military Attitudes, Policies and Practices, 1763-1789* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1971), in the Macmillan Wars of the United States Series. In the same series, Douglas Edward Leach, *Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America, 1607-1763* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1973), and see reviews, W. J. Eccles, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd S., XXXI (July, 1974), 501-503; Darrett B. Rutman, *Journal of American History* LXI (June, 1974), 156-158, the first review rather critical, the second rather favorable.

⁵⁵ Ivor Noel Hume, *A Guide to the Artifacts of Colonial America*. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970); William P. Cumming, *British Maps of Colonial America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press for the Herman Dunlap Smith Center for the History of Cartography, The Newberry Library, 1974). See also, Hume, *Historical Archaeology* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969), as well as Walter Muir Whitehill, *The Arts in Early American History; Needs and Opportunities for Study...* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1965). Two other recent publications are of interest here, Howard Mumford Jones, *Revolution and Romanticism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1974), and Meyer Reinhold, ed., *The Classic Pages: Classical Reading of Eighteenth-Century Americans* (University Park, Pa.: The Commission on Classical Humanities in the American Republic of the American Philological Association, by Pennsylvania State University, 1975).

SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY AND NOTES

This bibliography and notes are intended as supplements to the notes from my "Survey of Issues." They have several purposes. First, they provide information on a few important publications which have come to my attention since the article was completed. Second, they supply information about a few of the most important recent symposia and conferences which celebrate the United States Bicentennial in historical perspective. (Of course almost every local and state historical society has provided some form of conference. I have made no attempt to cite all or to fairly represent a cross section). Finally, these notes provide source information for bibliographies which are available. In all cases I have provided addresses through which scholars and teachers can receive information and publications.

I. *Important recent publications:*

- David Brion Davis. *The Problem of Slavery in the American Revolution, 1770-1823*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1975.
- Robert A. Gross. *The Minutemen and Their World*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1976.
- Merrill Jensen. *The American Revolution Within America*. New York: New York University Press, 1976.
- Charles S. Olton. *Artisans for Independence: Philadelphia Mechanics and the American Revolution*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1975.
- Jonathan G. Rossie. *The Politics of Command in the American Revolution*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1975.
- John Shy. *A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggle for American Independence*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Page Smith. *A New Age Now Begins: A People's History of the American Revolution*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1975. (2 vols.)
- William Appleman Williams. *America Confronts a Revolutionary World, 1776-1976*. New York: William Morrow and Co., 1976.
- Alfred F. Young, ed. *The American Revolution: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism*. DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 1976.

These books are the subject of two review essays by Edmund Morgan, *The New York Review of Books*, Vol. XXIII, Nos. 12 and 13, two very interesting essays which support the consensus view of the American Revolution. Williams, Young, Jensen and Olton receive a good deal of criticism from Morgan, Smith receives some praise. Davis's book is not included in the reviews, but it represents a continuing effort to place slavery in a Marxist perspective. His thesis is that abolition during the period provided an ideological gloss for the emergence of American capitalism.

II. *Bicentennial Symposium, Institutes and Conferences:*

Almost every state has created a bicentennial commission or agency which is responsible for celebration of the anniversary. Many of these are engaged in some historical work, several have provided subventions for publication, most notably those of New York, Maryland, North Carolina and Florida. State commissions have sponsored special institutes, often in conjunction with universities or local historical societies. For the year 1976 these institutes are listed with the American Revolutionary Bicentennial Administration in an excellent calendar titled BINET. Also listed are federal events under the sponsorship of the Commission, the National Audiovisual Center, the National Archives and Records Center and the General Services Administration. Information may be obtained from:

American Revolutionary Bicentennial Administration
2401 E St.
Washington, D. C. 20276

Conferences and Symposia

Florida Historical Society, University of Florida and the Conference on Military History, symposium, "American Loyalists," February, 1975. Editor, Claude C. Sturgill:

Claude C. Sturgill
Department of History
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

North Carolina American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and the University of North Carolina, symposium, "The Experience of the Revolution in North Carolina and the South," September-October, 1975. No editor given. For publication information:

North Carolina Bicentennial
109 E. Jones St.
Raleigh, NC 27611

University of Mississippi, conference, "The Slave Experience in America: A Bicentennial Perspective," October, 1975. No editor given. For publication information:

Conference on the Slave Experience
Department of History
University of Mississippi
University, MS 38677

State Historical Society of Wisconsin and the University of Wisconsin, a symposium in honor of Professor Merrill Jensen, April, 1976. For publication information:

Norman Risjord
Department of History
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WS 53706

University of Tennessee, conference, "The American Revolution," April, 1976. For publication information:

Milton M. Klein
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37916

University of Alabama, symposium, "The South in the American Revolution," May, 1976. For publication information:

Warren Moore
Interim Term Office
Box 1940
University, AL 35486

Stanford University, conference, "The American Revolution in the Modern World," July, 1976. For publication information:

Betty K. Eldon
Department of History
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Princeton Theological Seminary and Rider College, institute, "Religion and the American Revolution," July, 1976. For publication information:

Director and Editor, Summer School
Princeton Theological Seminary
Princeton, NJ 08540

Southeastern American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, conference, "'1776 and All That': The World of the 1700's in Europe and America," October, 1976. For publication information:

Paul G. Dobson
North Georgia College
Dahlonega, GA 30533

Conference and Symposium Series

Sleepy Hollow Restorations, Inc., continuing symposium, topics of interest:

- "Aspects of Early New York Society and Politics," publication, Irving Polishook and Jacob Judd, eds., *Aspects of Early New York Society and Politics*. Tarrytown, New York: Sleepy Hollow Restorations, Inc., 1974.
- "Loyalist America," publication, Robert A. East and Jacob Judd, eds., *Loyalist America: A Focus*. Tarrytown, New York: Sleepy Hollow Restorations, Inc., 1975.
- "America's Wooden Age," publication, Brooke Hindle, ed., *America's Wooden Age: Aspects of Its Early Technology*. Tarrytown, New York: Sleepy Hollow Restorations, Inc., 1975.
- "The Idea of Party and Factionalism in Colonial America," no publication planned. Chairman, Patricia U. Bonomi.

American Revolution Bicentennial Commission of Florida, Annual Bicentennial Symposium, topics:

- "Eighteenth-Century Florida and Its Borderlands," publication, Samuel Proctor, ed., *Eighteenth-Century Florida and Its Borderlands*. Gainesville, Florida: University Presses of Florida, 1975.
- "Eighteenth-Century Florida: Life on the Frontier," publication, Samuel Proctor, ed., *Eighteenth-Century Florida: Life on the Frontier*. Gainesville, Florida: University Presses of Florida, 1976.
- "Eighteenth-Century Florida and the Revolutionary South," publication, Samuel Proctor, ed., *Eighteenth-Century Florida and the Revolutionary South*. Gainesville, Florida: University Presses of Florida, 1976.
- "Eighteenth-Century Florida: Impact of the American Revolution," publication, Samuel Proctor, ed., in process.

Library of Congress, Five Symposia:

- "The Development of a Revolutionary Mentality," chairman, Richard B. Morris, publication, *The Development of a Revolutionary Mentality*. Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress, 1972.
- "Fundamental Testaments of the American Revolution," chairman, Julian Boyd, publication, *The Fundamental Testaments of the American Revolution*. Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress, 1973.
- "Leadership in the American Revolution," chairman, Lymon H. Butterfield, publication, *Leadership in the American Revolution*. Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress, 1974.
- "Impact of the American Revolution Abroad," chairman, Richard B. Morris, publication, *Impact of the American Revolution Abroad*. Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress, 1976.

III. *Bibliographies:*

Primary in the study of colonial and early United States history is the Institute for Early American History, Williamsburg, Virginia. Publications which result from study at the Institute most often appear through the University of North Carolina Press, in paperback through Norton and Norton Publishers. The Institute has published two bibliographies which are indispensable:

Books About Early America, 4th edition. Williamsburg, Virginia: For the Institute, 1970.
Books About Early America, 1970-1975. Williamsburg, Virginia: For the Institute, 1976.

For teachers the American Bibliographical Center—Clio Press, has published useful bibliographical lists on the period. These can be obtained through:

ABC—Clio, Inc.
Riverside Campus
Box 4397
Santa Barbara, CA 93103

Scholars who are interested in the loyalists will find valuable:

American Antiquarian Society *Proceedings*, Part I, Vol. 85, April, 1975, "Bibliography of Loyalist Source Material in the United States," comp., Herbert Leventhan and James E. Mooney.

A series of publications which appears in few standard bibliographical searches comes from the People's Bicentennial Commission, a private group dedicated to establishing "economic democracy" in the United States. Listings of their publications may be obtained from:

Publications
People's Bicentennial Commission
Washington, D. C. 20036